

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, HAVANT,
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XIX

JULY, 1929

No. 109

EDITORIAL

WHAT is the importance of miracle? The question has been brought before the public during the past month in two significant addresses. On June 4 the *Morning Post* gave prominence to a paper* read by Sir Ambrose Fleming, F.R.S., in which this distinguished scientist upheld both the possibility of miracles from the standpoint of science and their necessity for any adequate theism. On the following Sunday, the Bishop of Birmingham, preaching at Westminster Abbey, claimed that for those acquainted with modern science miracle was no longer an aid to faith, and that it had best be left aside so that more important matters may be pressed on. It would be difficult to imagine a more startling reversal of ancient rôles—here the layman and man of science pleading powerfully for miracle in the interests of theism, there the bishop decrying it as of no concern for the convinced believer in evolution. On such a matter we suspect that the public will be more impressed by the man of science than by the bishop.

The mechanization of modern life necessitates a fresh emphasis on the importance of miracle as one of the great symbols and guarantees of the transcendence of God. In that sense it is a standing and recurrent safeguard against the evolutionary immanentism of which Dr. Barnes has made himself the apostle. What theism requires, as Sir Ambrose points out, is that God's action in the world should be on the one hand orderly and constant, and on the other such as to show that He is personal and free, the Lord of His own creation. The doctrine of divine immanence has an undoubted place in Christian belief, though, like the doctrine of evolution, it is far

* We understand that this paper is to be published in due course in the Transactions of the Victoria Institute.

less simple than the Bishop of Birmingham suggests. But when it claims the whole field of theism, it becomes at once a danger to Christianity. For it shirks precisely those awkward facts of human freedom, sin, and guilt, with which any truly redemptive religion must deal. Miracle comes to meet what our deepest experience tells us is true—that the world is out of joint with God who made it—and gives us added assurance that He who made is also able to restore. Lose the belief in miracle, and the belief in the divine transcendence—and even in the divine righteousness—will not long survive it. This does not, of course, mean that we are entitled to adopt an uncritical attitude towards narratives of miracle, whether in the Bible or elsewhere; but still less are we entitled to adopt an uncritical interpretation of the meaning of evolution.

With the advent of a Labour Government to power, the political history of our country is likely to enter upon a very interesting phase; and the English Church, at once the oldest and the most widespread institution in the national life, cannot fail to be much stirred by the new situation. What has happened is no mere accident of the hustings. It seems certain that the Labour party owed far less than either of the other parties to the expenditure of money on propaganda, both before and during the election; and it is therefore reasonable to assume that its cause represented an underlying earnestness and enthusiasm in the electorate which would not be gainsaid. Nor did the Labour leaders offer any bombastic promises; their policy was largely held in reserve, and they take office with hands free. They are a party of realists, in close touch with the places where the shoe pinches; and we may expect that a resolute effort will be made to subdue the social and economic machinery of life more fully to the interests of man. In the pursuit of that aim the Government will certainly have the support and sympathy of the Church.

THOUGHTS ON THE BLESSED TRINITY

II

It is a most valuable part of our inheritance as Christians of the Anglican Communion that we have in the "articles of belief" enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer three Symbols—the Apostles', the Nicene, and the (so-called) "Athanasian" Creed—each one of which is representative of a great group or family of Creeds and Confessions of faith. We are thus enabled to see each one of these Creeds in its own setting, and as against its own historic and doctrinal background. And this is most important for the right understanding of the Creeds of the Church. The "Apostles' Creed," for example, is typical of the group of baptismal Creeds in the West; the "Nicene" of the Eastern group of Confessions, whether oecumenical, synodical, or individual; and, finally, the *Quicumque vult* is representative of that group of utterances in which the exposition of the mystery of the Holy Trinity, as such, is of primary and distinctive importance.

But each and all of these Creeds and groups of symbols go back ultimately to the Baptismal Confession, and find therein their historical source and point of departure. It is the confession of that Name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost into which we were baptized. The sacred formula of Baptism implicitly contains and includes those truths concerning the three Divine Persons which are set forth in those later and fuller creedal statements which we have been considering. In Baptism we confess our faith in Jesus Christ as the risen and glorified Lord, in God the Father who hath sent Him, and in the Holy Ghost, the Divine Witness and Life-giver.

And yet, the ancient Creeds, like all other human documents, have their limitations. Their horizon is the horizon of those early centuries of the Christian Church in which they were framed. To say this is not to impugn the objective truth and value of their testimony. Through them, that Holy Spirit who inhabits the Church did speak, and still does speak. The Creeds bear authoritative witness to that which is the Christian truth. But was it not John Robinson who spoke to the Puritans as they were setting sail from Delftshaven to find a home in the Western continent: "God hath yet more light to break out of His Word"? The "three Creeds," as we have them in the Prayer Book, fail to give explicit expression to the great fact of the new life "in Christ Jesus" as a *present reality*. They seem to envisage "eternal life" as something belonging only to the

future state. It is "the life of the world to come" which follows upon "the resurrection of the dead." We must add at once that this statement is not strictly true of all ancient Confessions. We have that of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, which, after the acknowledgment of "the One only unbegotten Father" and of "the One Lord, Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God," proceeds as follows:

"We acknowledge One Holy Spirit, who renewed both the holy men of the Old Covenant and the divine disciples of the New (Covenant) which (now) obtains."* There is also the Baptismal Confession which is found in the Coptic version of the "Apostolic Constitutions," and which reads as follows: "I believe in the true God alone, the Father, the Almighty: and (in) His Only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour: and in His Holy Spirit, the all-quickening . . . one sole Godhead, one only Lordship (Herrschaft), one only Kingdom, one only Faith, one only Baptism, in the holy Catholic Apostolic Church, unto eternal life. Amen."† Here the thought of our renewal unto eternal life as a *present* reality seems clearly evident.

We are baptized *into* the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Does not this mean that the life of the holy and ever-blessed Godhead is, in some sense, communicated to us, finite creatures though we are?—that we are made to share in it? The "one God," the "Son of God," the "life eternal"—that we are embraced within the sphere of these Divine Realities? Is not this the testimony of St. John in his first Epistle (v. 20): "We are *in* him that is true—in his Son, Jesus Christ. *This is the true God, and the life eternal*"? Can this mean less than that, in our own case, as well as in the case of the Divine Son, manhood is "taken into God"?

Now let us take our "three Creeds" *seriatim*, beginning with the last and proceeding to the first, and consider them for a moment with reference to this point.

The "Creed of Athanasius" confines itself to the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation; although there follows a brief summary of the acts of the incarnate Lord as Redeemer and Judge. *Creation* is not referred to; neither the first nor the second creation being mentioned. It is only that the three Divine Persons are (through each of them being declared "increate") *separated* from the order or category of "creatures." No mention is made of Baptism, although salvation is made conditional upon the right belief in the great doctrines of the Faith—the doctrines, namely, of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation.

* Hahn, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 20.

† The translation given above is made from the German translation found in Hahn, pp. 156, 157.

The "Nicene" Creed, while it does indeed mention Baptism, speaks of it only in connection with "the remission of sins"; no specific reference being made to the imparting of that new life which is "in Christ Jesus." And finally, the "Apostles' Creed," while affirming "the remission of sins," thereby makes only implicit or indirect reference to the "one Baptism." Moreover, in all three of these Creeds, "eternal life" in its sequence follows the "resurrection of the dead."

Is it not a fact that in all three Creeds it is a *transcendent* Godhead upon which almost exclusive emphasis is laid, rather than upon a Godhead who has revealed Himself as graciously self-communicating? Do we not need to recognize, in and through the sacraments, an "extension" of the life of the Holy Trinity, even as we have come to recognize therein a certain "extension of the Incarnation"? Do we not need to give fuller scope to the thought of the Ever-blessed Trinity as graciously *inclusive* Being, and not merely as transcendent and incommunicable Deity? Does not this belong to the message which the Divine Spirit is bringing to us through the Christian thought and experience of the present day?

And now perhaps we are in a better position to deal with the question which we proposed to ourselves at the outset, and to attempt to answer the query: May we, in the light of the theology of the Church, and (above all) in the light of the New Testament Revelation—may we, I say, recognize a *threefold* Trinity; a doctrinal complex which, *in itself*, and not only in relation to the transcendent Object which it seeks to set forth, is three and yet one? This, as I said at the beginning, would seem to be in accordance with the movement of progressive analysis which is steadily going forward in all sciences, and which is, as it has ever been in the past, vital and essential to theology today. Is there, perhaps, in addition to the lines of interpretation which we have endeavoured to set forth in the preceding pages, a *third* line of Trinitarian interpretation? One which, no less than the others, may claim Scriptural and New Testament authority; but one whose form is possibly less metaphysical, less dogmatic than the others? It is—as I have elsewhere endeavoured to set forth*—"the Trinity as manifested in the light of the Resurrection and glorification of Jesus Christ." Characteristic of the "Trinity of Self-consciousness" is the distinction of the Divine "Persons" as "First," "Second," and "Third." The characteristic Names of the "Trinity of Origination" are what we may reverently speak of as God's *family* Names—"Father," "Son," and "Holy Spirit." What, then, we ask, are the characteristic Names under which

* *Theology of Personality*, pp. 151 f.

this "Trinity" to which we now refer is revealed to us? We turn to the New Testament, as the ultimate source of all our theological knowledge, and what is it that we find?

"There is the Risen 'Lord,' who is both human and divine. There is the 'God' who hath raised Him from the dead, and exalted Him as 'Head over all things to his Church.' And in inseparable connection and union with these two Divine Persons, a third is manifested—that is, the Life-giving Spirit. These three Names—'God,' 'Lord' (as indicating the Person of the Risen Jesus), and 'Spirit'—we find constantly recurring throughout the New Testament Epistles, and they are always seen in closest association and connection with each other. Two outstanding instances will at once occur to mind.

"1. One of them is that familiar benediction at the close of St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians: 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.'*

"2. The other is in that passage in the First Epistle to the Corinthians† in which St. Paul is instructing the members of the Church in Corinth concerning 'spiritual gifts.' He says: 'Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are diversities of ministrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all.'

"It will be observed that the characteristic Divine Names occurring in these two passages do not include those of 'Father' and of 'Son.' The conception of 'origination,' or 'derivation of essence,' is not here indicated. The Divine Three are envisaged as in their relation to us within the sphere of grace, and of the new Covenant. At the same time they are presented as existing side by side (so to speak) in closest and ineffable union. Their operations, in the charismatic 'gifts' and varied 'ministrations' of the Christian community, are the same. There is a concurrence in action; there is an identity in each and every divine act and manifestation, as well as in the divine thought and purpose which lie back of the act. Act, thought, and purpose belong equally to each One of the divine Three; each One is, equally with the Others, the Agent in all the operations of grace. 'God,' the 'Lord,' and the 'Spirit' can no more be separated from each other than can the 'love,' the 'grace,' and the 'fellowship' which are the individual manifestations and communications of Each. The Three are One. They are not only morally but metaphysically identified; while at the same time each One is personally distinct from the other Two. Each is self-existent; Each is eternal; for the reason that

* 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

† 1 Cor. xii. 4-6 (R.V.).

the individual Names—'God,' 'Lord,' and 'Spirit'—*include* and *imply* each other; they are not mutually exclusive, they are mutually inclusive, terms. And the *metaphysical* implications of this fact are not to be overlooked, any more than are its *moral* implications. Thus the Triune Being is revealed not only in mutuality of inner personal life, but also in relation to redeemed and renewed humanity, within the sphere of grace, and of the life which is 'in Christ Jesus.' The standpoint from which we recognize the presence and operations of the holy and divine Three is, confessedly, the standpoint of *redemption*; we are here within the sphere of the new covenant of grace. Out of our own personal experience 'in Christ' we recognize that the divine Source of power and love and wisdom is Three and yet One.*

"3. There is another passage which must not be overlooked in this connection. It is in the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians (verses 4-6), where St. Paul, in exhorting the disciples to unity, appeals to the fact of the 'one Spirit,' the 'one Lord,' and the 'one God and Father of all.' Each of the seven great unities here mentioned (as will be seen by reference to the text) is to be regarded as including all the rest. The 'one baptism,' for example, includes and implies the great realities of God, of Christ, and of the Spirit, as well as the 'one body' into which we are incorporated; it is based upon the 'one faith' which we profess, and it points forward to the 'one hope' of our salvation. These unities, mutually inclusive as they are, indicate a oneness of essence as existing between the divine Persons upon whom our life depends; they also indicate a oneness as existing between ourselves and the divine Source of our life. Thus is fulfilled the Saviour's prayer for His disciples: 'That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.'"[†]

St. Clement of Rome[‡] gives expression in simple form to

* In this connection we may well take note of the language of the "Apostolic Constitutions" in that passage (VI. xi.) where the faith in the Blessed Trinity, and in creation and redemption through Christ, the God-Man, is set forth. Its opening words are as follows: (But) "we, *who are the children of God and the sons of peace*, do preach the holy and right word of piety, and declare the one only God, . . . the Father of Christ . . . the Father of one Son, not of many; of one Comforter, by Christ; the Maker of the other orders, the one Creator of the several creatures, by Christ."

[†] I feel that a word of apology is due on the writer's part for having introduced so long a quotation from one of his published works. But it seemed important, in bringing forward the New Testament evidence on the point under consideration, to present that evidence in as terse a manner as possible, while at the same time omitting none of the essential material of that evidence. As I felt unable to improve upon the form in which I had already presented this New Testament evidence, I have thought it best simply to reproduce the paragraphs as they appear in the book above referred to.

[‡] Epist. I. ad Corinth., c. 58.

the faith of the early Church in this divine Three who are yet One. It is in a solemn asseveration that the faithful obedience of Christian men shall surely lead to final salvation and victory, through Christ. His words are: "As God liveth, and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Spirit, who are the faith and the hope of the elect, so surely shall he, who with lowliness of mind and instant in gentleness hath, without regretfulness, performed the ordinances and commandments that are given by God, be enrolled and have a name among the number of them that are saved through Jesus Christ, through whom is the glory unto Him for ever and ever."

Is it not a fact that this particular form of expression of the truth of the divine Three in One is seen to stand out in greater distinctness upon the background of the Old Testament Revelation? It is obvious that during the period of the Old Covenant—the dispensation of "Moses and the prophets"—the fact of divine Fatherhood and divine Sonship as correlative and eternal realities had not been clearly revealed. Nevertheless, the fact of a *plurality* as existing within the divine unity is evidenced by manifold testimonies within the Old Testament Revelation itself. The "Jehovah" to whom its pages bear such constant witness cannot be interpreted as one sole and solitary Person. The "Angel of Jehovah," sent by Him on manifold occasions, either to individuals or groups of persons, is at the same time One with Him who sends Him. The manifested Lord, while distinguished from, is at the same time identified with, that Lord who is invisible. "No man can see my face and live,"* was the awe-inspiring word to Moses; yet Moses testifies that the elders at Mount Sinai both "saw the God of Israel" and "did eat and drink" in His presence.† "Whom shall I send?" was the divine question heard by the prophet Isaiah in his vision—"whom shall I send, and who will go for us?"‡ To which the prophet's answer was, "Here am I, send me." God and "the Lord" are already distinguished, while yet identified, in the Old Testament Revelation. And, together with These, is discerned—though not in so distinctly personal a form—a Third, even the "Spirit of Jehovah."§

Do we not find in these Old Testament testimonies that the

* Exod. xxxiii. 20.

† Ibid., xxiv. 10, 11.

‡ Isaiah vi. 8.

§ This distinction between the "Angel of the Lord"—or again, between the "Word of the Lord"—and God Himself, is recognized by all the early Church Fathers and writers; in fact, down to the time of St. Augustine. St. Augustine it was who introduced a different and less Scriptural mode of interpretation when, having identified the invisible God with the Trinity (*ipsa Trinitas*), rather than with the Person of God the Father, he was led to interpret the "Angel of Jehovah" as a merely created being—one of the "innumerable company of angels." St. Augustine's novel interpretation—as will readily be seen—in effect paved the way for angel-worship in the Church. For if *one* is to be worshipped and adored, why not *all*?

foundation has already been laid for that New Testament revelation of the same "God," of the same "Lord," of the same "Holy Spirit" who have manifested Themselves to us Christians in and through the new Covenant of grace, which has been realized and made effective through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ? It is not so much that the metaphysical dogma of the Trinity is offered to the unregenerate child of Adam as a *sine quâ non* of salvation. It is, rather, that the recognition of the Holy Three springs out of, as it is involved in, all our life and experience, as those who are new-created "*in Christ Jesus*."

In the light of the evidence from the New Testament which we have been considering, and of its Old Testament background, let us now turn back to the Nicene Creed, with which we began. Let us seek to apply to the Creed a bit of grammatico-critical analysis from the point of view of its use of the divine Names. Be it observed that we have here to consider not only the Names of *Father* and of *Son*. It is, as we have seen, a characteristic feature of this Creed to develop and set forth that relation which subsists between the divine "Son" and His "Father" from "before all worlds." As Son, He is "God of God," "Light of Light," "very God of very God." It is a relationship of *origin* which is here indicated. But let it not be overlooked that, in relative distinction from these Names of "Father" and of "Son," we already find, in the very opening words of the Creed, that distinction which (as we have seen) is in evidence in that original and normative passage 1 Cor. viii. 6—the distinction, namely, between the "one God" (the Father Almighty) and the "one Lord" Jesus Christ (the Only-begotten Son of God). We here recognize that (relative) distinction between the divine Names "God" and "Lord" which, as we have seen, has its foundation deep-laid in the Old Testament Revelation. This means that there is a critique of the use of the divine Names which may be brought to bear upon the Creeds of the Church no less than upon the opening chapters of the Book of Genesis. This relative distinction between "God" and "Lord" is, however, transcended and "overcome" in the "Athanasian" Creed, which affirms of each divine "Person" singly that He is both "God" and "Lord." It is not an absolute, but only a relative, distinction. Nevertheless, it has its value and its validity, which may not be overlooked.

It is, then, in the varying and contrasted use of the divine Names—"God" and "Lord," "Father" and "Son"—that we may find the basis, as I venture to believe, for a threefold interpretation of the sublime fact of the Holy Trinity. The characteristic Nicene interpretation is that of a "Trinity of origin"; for in it the concept of origination is applied not only to

the Son but to the Holy Spirit as well. In the characteristic interpretation of the *Quicumque vult* (given in verses 3-19) we find the basis laid for the "Trinity of Self-consciousness," as I have endeavoured to explain. While, beside these two, there is a third and closely related form of interpretation. This is differentiated from the other two, in that it neither makes explicit distinction between the "person" and the "substance," nor yet does it bring into the foreground the paternal-filial relation in the Godhead. Rather does it simply envisage the Holy Three—God, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit—as not only existing in Divine glory, but as co-operating for us and with us in the covenant of grace, both for our salvation and for the complete realization of the Divine Kingdom. It is, in the language of St. Clement of Rome, witnessing to the simple faith of the early Church—it is "God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit" who are "the faith and hope of the elect."

WILLIAM S. BISHOP.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH: NATIONAL

WHAT do we mean when we say that our Church is National? There are several answers to that question. One is that it is the Body which the law of the land recognizes as representing the religion of the nation. This is no new theory: it has always been so since there was a State, and a Church, in England. Another answer is that it represents in a very special way the national characteristics of Englishmen, their calmness, their stability, their love of settled order. A third answer is that the history of the Church in England, not only now, but at the time of the Roman supremacy, shows it to be National. It was *Ecclesia Anglicana* in the time of King John and Innocent III. So it is now. The critical time lies between the Norman Conquest and the Reformation.

The Church in its relation to the State between the Norman Conquest and the Reformation occupied a very different position from that which it occupied before and after that period. In the time before, and in the time after, the relation was a comparatively simple one—I say only "comparatively" simple, because I do not forget Lord Penzance and the Public Worship Regulation Bill, and the Act of Uniformity, and the difference between an opinion and a judgment, and many other curious things.

Before the Norman Conquest there were but two parties to the constitutional position to be considered: the State, patron-

izing and sympathetic, but guided; and the Church, which appeared in England almost entirely under the aspect of a national institution. Rome was practically, though not theoretically, a negligible quantity. In the last period also the relation is a simple one. In the relation of Church to State, Rome, of course, has been eliminated altogether. The Church has a clearly defined position, clear rights—though I am forced to say that those rights have been constantly disregarded. The State has a clear position, which is undisturbed by any foreign influence.

But in the intervening period—say from 1066 to 1509—the case was different. There are three factors in the relation between Church and State to be considered. They are the Church in England, the Church in Rome, and the English State. And the subject is, when we try to look back into the past and understand it, found to be beset with difficulties. It is very difficult to make a wholly satisfactory and coherent theory of the position of the Church in its relation to the State. And, on the other hand, two very clear and coherent theories have been set forth in regard to two elements in the question—the Church of England and the Church of Rome—the one by the late Bishop Stubbs, the other by the late Professor Maitland; and they contradict each other. But the contradiction has perhaps been unduly emphasized. What Stubbs said in the last edition of his *Lectures on Medieval and Modern History*, published a year before his death, does not reveal so great a divergence as some have thought; and to the last he believed that he had written true history. Those who read the article of Mr. Bullard in *THEOLOGY*, August, 1927, were probably astonished: those who read Dr. Coulton in February, 1929, were certainly not surprised by his sound learning and his emphatic controversial style. Where doctors such as Stubbs and Maitland differ I could not supply any satisfactory solution of difficulties; and all I shall here attempt to do is to suggest how far we may consider that we have arrived at any solid certainties in the matter.

It will be best, then, in the first place, to take the question on which we can come to something of a conclusion. The relation of the State to the Church in England: that is a fairly clear subject. It must be agreed that the State claimed and exercised a real supremacy. This is quite clear in the following ways: (1) Church law could not be carried out except under the sanction of the State. When the State, whether by arbitrary power (as under Henry II. or Edward I.), or by prohibitions from the law-courts (as throughout the greater part of the Middle Ages as well as in later times), chose to interfere with particular directions of the Church's officers, those directions

could not be carried out. (2) The higher Church officers were appointed, as now, by nomination of the State. Bishops almost without exception, abbats very frequently, were chosen on the suggestion of the Crown; that is, the first choice—the practical choice—was the King's; the second choice—the legal choice—was that of the electing body. Stephen possibly allowed, for a short time, free election: Magna Carta promised it. But the occasions on which it was really exercised are so rare as to be entirely unimportant in ecclesiastical, or constitutional, or legal history. (3) The whole external relations of the Church were subject to State control. The proofs of this are to be found in the first clause of nearly all our great constitutional documents, laws, or charters, in the laws concerning Church property, and in the laws concerning Church appeals. (4) The State put forth edicts and laws as to what clergymen individually or as corporations might do or might not do, and these laws had to be obeyed, at men's peril; such were the Constitutions of Clarendon, the writ *circumspecte agatis*, the statutes of Provisors and Præmunire. How each of these State enactments fared does not, for our purpose, much matter; it is sufficient that they were put forth by the State and that they were, in whatever circumstances and for however short a time, obeyed.

So far, by eliminating a few difficulties, we have a pretty clear position. But two questions immediately arise: How far did the Church of England accept this position? and, Is it correct to speak of such a thing as the Church of England at all? As to the first, I should say that the Church, on the whole, did accept it—often, no doubt, under protest; but still the fact that during these nearly 500 years there is this general summary of the relations between the two to be obtained, and that during the whole time the chief ministers of the State were ecclesiastics, justifies us in our conclusion.

But how about the other question? Some of our friends are fond of reminding us that England is only two provinces of the Catholic Church; and Professor Maitland has said that "too often we speak of 'the Church of England,' and forget that there was no ecclesiastically organized body that answered in that name." Quite true; the province of Canterbury had no authority over or within the province of York, and it has none now. The archbishopric of Paris (when it was founded) was quite separate from the archbishopric of Rheims; but there was a Gallican Church, nevertheless. Lanfranc (Ep. 23) distinctly asserted the unity of the English Church; and Henry I., in his charter, which Stephen Langton produced to the barons for an example, and those who drew up Magna Carta itself, knew quite well what they were talking about when they spoke clearly and unhesi-

tatingly of *Ecclesia Anglicana*—the English Church. There always has been, since the time of Augustine, and there always will be—it would be faithless, indeed, to doubt it—truly and really, an English Church.

But now we come to the real difficulty. This English Church was and is part of One Holy Catholic Church, from the laudable customs of which, we shall remember, our Reformers did not desire to depart. This fact must inevitably enter into and profoundly affect the question of the relation of the English Church to the English State. The powers that be are ordained of God, but when we say that we must not forget that there is in the Church the power of the perpetual presence of God Himself. I must restrict myself entirely to the Middle Ages, and I must endeavour to answer the question, What was the effect of this wider obligation on the relation of the Church to the State? The Church in England was, during this period, bound to the Church abroad, in Western Europe, in a way in which she was not bound before, and in which, owing to a sharp stroke of severance, she has not been since. What did that bond actually mean? The whole question has been made to turn on the obligation of canon law. Now, canon law is, I think—though I speak with great diffidence—too much regarded as if it was, in the mind of the English medieval clergy and lawyers, simply the *Corpus Iuris Canonici*—that is, the *Decretum* of Gratian, the *Decretals* of Gregory IX., the *Liber Sextus* of Boniface VIII., the *Clementinæ*, and the *Extravagantes*. If I am not mistaken, it was more than that: it was (in the words of the statute 25 Henry VIII., c. 19), all “canons, constitutions, ordinances, and synodals provincial already made” in England.

There were distinct Church laws, that is, binding on Englishmen, which were not binding on Italians or Frenchmen. That is one point, and it profoundly affected the relation of Church and State; for the “English canon law” (so to speak), as referred to, for example, in William I.’s edict separating the courts, and in Eadmer’s account of his “customs” affecting the Church, was to a very great extent under State influence, if not control, and under State sanction. But where the question actually arose, was the final decision to be based on *Roman* canon law or not?

All I think it is possible to say is this: (1) When the State allowed it, as it did very usually throughout the Middle Ages, appeals went finally to the court of Rome, *ad dominum papam*. Inevitably the inferior courts tended to tune their decisions to the Pope’s pitch, or to write their music (shall we say?) in the Pope’s favourite key. This did not necessarily involve the absolute supremacy of Roman canon law. It was the scientific juris-

prudence, to be appealed to in case of doubt; but there were very many things which might prevent its ever being appealed to at all. There might be in such-and-such a case the known rule of English common law, or the actual interference of the State, or the judicious decision of the ecclesiastical Judge, or the want of money in the pocket of the suitor wherewith to appeal; and every one of these grounds was, if I mistake not, acceptable to English churchmen as well as English laymen.

Here I may quote the last words of Stubbs on the question:

"I have thought and intended to maintain my belief that the Corpus Juris Canonici in its various expansions affected the law and process of the English Courts, which had been framed before the Decretum was published, not as statute law, but rather as case law, or precedents, or as in a sense modifying or expounding the common law of the Church; determining the mind of the judge rather than pronouncing indisputable or immediately applicable conclusions. In this I may have been quite wrong. . . .

"On the other hand, I never doubted that within its own area of applicability the Roman Canon Law did practically govern the ecclesiastical courts wherever it was not contrariant to the common law, or overruled by the use of prohibitions, or thrown out of use by the protests of parliaments or such statutes as those of Præmunire and Provisors. That a code liable to be overruled in such ways should be regarded as having a vitality and force analogous to that of the national law in temporal matters—that is, that the Corpus Juris stood, in the strict ecclesiastical courts, on the same level as the Statute Book—in the temporal courts, I could not see; and knowing that what authority it had it owed rather to tacit assumption than to formal and constitutional acceptance by Church or State, I offered my explanation as sufficient. The question does not affect the fact, but the nature of the authority."*

(2) An exaggerated view of the subservience of the English courts to the Roman canon law may be derived from the study of English writers on canon law. Like most people who write books, they delighted to rely on other people who wrote books before them, and those on whom they all had to rely were Roman canonists. It has been cutely pointed out that an exactly similar view might be obtained by an isolated study of the English writers on secular law and constitutional custom. The so-called Glanville, the *Dialogus de Scaccario*, the treatise of Bracton, would lead the reader to believe, from the view they took of the royal power, that the Roman civil law was the foundation of and the supreme authority over the English law. The statements we find, for example, as to the condition of the serfs are pure Roman law; they are set forth, with no hint of doubt, in the books I have mentioned; but we know that, as a matter of fact, they are not true of English custom or law at all. Now this, I believe, is to a great extent true of the position of

* *Lectures on Medieval and Modern History*, pp. 335, 336 (edit. 1900).

the canon law in England. Lawyers regarded it as governed by the Roman canon law; and, if matters went so far in actual practice, the rule of canon law would govern the decision, if the State did not prevent it. But none the less, there was a distinct national element in English Church law and English ecclesiastical courts.

[(3) Actual practice must be considered. Whatever the theory, parts of Roman canon law were not, and could not be, carried out in practice in England. The State interfered, and in a great number of cases it cannot be said that the English Church objected to the interference. In such matters as "provisions" it may even be said that the interference was welcomed. The extreme dislike with which the English bishops (as Professor Pollard shows in his recent book on Wolsey) regarded the powers claimed and exercised by Wolsey as papal *legatus a latere* may be taken as an example of national feeling against papal assumption in matters in which ecclesiastical policy and canon law were concerned.

(4) Lastly, the Pope was considered, by some English canonists at least, to be the "universal ordinary," and his rescripts to supersede all others and take the place of all original jurisdiction. As a matter of fact, this view was never entirely carried out. The courts of Archbishops, Bishops, Archdeacons, did sit, and that as their own courts, not somebody else's; and give judgments as their own judgments, and not somebody else's. This was clearly Lanfranc's view, and it was held by many of his successors.

The conclusion which, with much deference to so learned an authority as Dr. Coulton, I suggest is this: In the Middle Ages the Church in England recognized the Royal supremacy and the Papal supremacy. As was natural, there was constant strife between the two supremacies, and the English Church itself was inclined at one time to favour one supremacy, at another another. But it is indubitable that throughout all these years it was, and knew that it was, a National Church, owing loyal submission to Cæsar in the things that are Cæsar's, owing a wider obedience to the universal rules of the universal Church, but still an essential part of that Church, not an abject slave to the court of the Bishop of one part of it, the Pope of Rome.

W. H. HUTTON.

THE PROBLEM OF SUNDAY SERVICES

I

A STUDY of recent statistics which appeared in THEOLOGY of February, 1929, suggests that the most pressing religious problem of our time is that of Sunday worship. There is little speculative atheism among our people, and the number of those who do not wish to lose the last link with organized religion tends to increase rather than decrease. That this vast army of potential worshippers is to a large extent absent from church on the ordinary Sunday needs no demonstrating. There are five rival attractions:

1. The Sunday newspaper now goes into nearly every home. It is crammed with reading matter, in some cases of a high cultural value, and the study of its columns occupies the morning very pleasantly, to say nothing of the competitions it provides.
2. Modern transport facilities have made Sunday the main day for travel and seeing the country.
3. Sunday golf and tennis have long been the portion of the richer classes. Now the London parks are available for sports on Sunday afternoons. Young men who have "changed" for a football match in the afternoon are not very likely to put on churchgoing clothes at night. Indeed, the very discarding of special Sunday clothes tends to make attendance at church more difficult.
4. In large cities cinemas are open on Sunday night.
5. The more serious-minded can listen to a broadcast service at home. Anticipating the point to be made below, let us here state the special problem that has arisen during the last few years. The Sacraments have nothing to fear from the development of broadcasting. Evensong has everything to fear, and it is none too early to begin to discuss its future.

Now any one of these five factors would have caused serious alarm in the nineteenth century. Our bewildered generation is confronted with all five at once. The problems of Anglicanism are *sui generis*. Nonconformity suffers in places as badly as Anglicanism, but it is often helped by the homogeneous character of its congregations, to whom the Sunday service is not only an act of worship but an opportunity for social intercourse; no feeling of reverence prevents happy greetings and conversation in the chapel before and after service. The Roman Catholic Church has the tremendous advantage of being able to teach that abstention from Sunday Mass is a sin. Whatever Anglicans feel on the subject, they cannot consistently pick out this one

portion of an authoritarian system while rejecting other duties inculcated by the same authority. Further, they have unnecessarily handicapped themselves by their theology of worship. Writers from whom better things might have been expected have agreed that the value of worship is in the long run subjective, that God cannot really require it for His own sake. "The Father *seeketh* such to worship Him." We need to get back to a wholesome *theocentrism*, to which it is the most natural thought imaginable that we do increase God's glory when we keep one day in seven holy, and correspondingly frustrate His purposes when we abstain from rendering Him public homage.

Probably the problem is fairly uniform throughout the Anglican Communion, but in the provinces of Canterbury and York it assumes a special shape just now. Apparently the Church of England has to adjust itself to the new situation and, abandoning for the present the hope of considerable liturgical improvements, to make the best of the Book of Common Prayer (with the deviations allowed by the 1928 Book). Here then is another reason for reconsidering the problem. In what follows the town church with a mixed congregation is chiefly in mind; children's services are only mentioned incidentally.

II

¶ We begin with "early services," everything prior to the hallowed hour of eleven, or half-past ten in the North. The 8 a.m. celebration is sometimes criticized and the nineteenth century revival is declared to have taken the wrong turning. It is sufficient to reply that we cannot reverse the habits of two, if not three, generations. It is liturgically wrong that Matins should follow the Communion of the devout, but the "early celebration" has taken such a hold of our people that we cannot abolish it. Ideally a general parish Communion at 9.30 with simple music would be much better. Had the Catholic Revival moved along these lines we might have been in a far stronger position today. But the facts of history are against us. We must make the best of our "early service" and try to secure more adequate preparation for the more frequent Communions now made.

The 9.30 Eucharist even under present conditions is undoubtedly the best for some parishes and the effort to introduce it is well worth while. It may be followed by an "Agape" in the parish hall, or, after an interval, by instruction along the lines of the Adult Schools of the Society of Friends. Mr. Browne-Wilkinson has convincingly pointed out its great value in teaching

children to be communicants as compared with the "Children's Eucharist" without communicants.*

An occasional 7 a.m. celebration should be provided, and where there is a sufficient staff it may well be every Sunday. There are always some who prefer it. Not everyone values an extra time in bed on Sunday morning. Some in middle life require less sleep and find early rising no hardship. Others cannot come so late as 8 consistently with their household duties. Others again want to communicate very early before starting out for the day. Yet another class prefer to come when the number of communicants is small.

III

For most English people whatever service is at 11 a.m. is the chief service of the day. The Prayer Book provides a service which for generations consisted of Matins, Litany, and Ante-Communion with Sermon, occasionally followed by the Communion proper, to which some "stayed." Though sermons are shorter, the amount of music now expected makes the whole service far too long for modern requirements. The conditions to be satisfied are, at least in some parishes, as follows:

1. The priest and some of the people want a sung Eucharist.
2. The older people want the Matins with Sermon to which they are accustomed.
3. The choir want at least some music the preparation of which will make it worth their while to attend practices.
4. The children need a short service and simple music.
5. The priest, if he is celebrating without food and is single-handed, cannot preach other than a short sermon, which indeed is welcomed by most of the congregation. But the ignorance of the laity, which causes so much trouble, is largely due to the shortness of the sermons!
6. The state of things common in Anglo-Catholic parishes, in which many devout persons communicate at 8 and worship at a sung Eucharist later, finishing their churchgoing then, and never hearing the psalms and lessons, involves devotional impoverishment.

To these conditions I should add (7): It is unwise to divide the congregation into two without absolute necessity. There are few churches which cannot hold the Sunday morning congregation with comfort; if it is halved for two distinct services the effect is depressing.

Clearly all the conditions cannot be satisfied. But if these

* *Sunday Morning and the Children*, in THEOLOGY, January, 1927; also as an S.P.C.K. pamphlet.

suggestions for Sunday worship are taken as a whole, the requirements not met on Sunday morning can be compensated for at the Evening Service, as will be seen below. A Morning Service can be devised which will satisfy all the above conditions except (3), and the need for sermons of fair length stated in (5). Without hurry, by careful planning the whole can be completed in 80 minutes. Full advantage must be taken of the omissions allowed in the 1928 Book. Omitting the Introduction to Matins and closing with the Benedictus, the Office can be sung in about 25 minutes. The Revised Lectionary and the Select Psalms normally save about 5 minutes in comparison with the older arrangement. When they fail to do so, compensation can be made by having shorter hymns in the Liturgy. If the music for the latter is simple, if hymns are short, the Commandments omitted, notices rigidly curtailed, and communicants only a handful, the time table can be kept. The sermon must not exceed 15 minutes as a maximum; it will normally be a devotional leading of the heart and will, in the light of acts or words of the God-Man, to take part in the offering that follows; the development of an argument is excluded.

With the rapid movement of the service and the avoidance of repetitions tedium will be obviated and the majority of the congregation will remain the whole time. Those who cannot do so will come in unobtrusively during the Benedictus or Introit, or depart after the Sermon if, in spite of peaceful suasion, they still desire to go. If the half-timers are more than a few it will probably be best to make a brief pause after Matins. The children of the morning Sunday School will be brought to church for a part of the Service, not always the same part. If the duty of fasting Communion is taught, but not in such a way as practically to excommunicate the aged and "women labouring with child," there will generally be a few communicants, which will help to impress on the children's minds the duty of *communicating*.* In practice such people will generally have taken a very light breakfast, hardly more than is now allowed to invalids by dispensation in the Roman Communion. On festivals the Service will take an hour and a half.

Some may criticize the concessions made to the demand for shortened services. But they are inevitable. Whether we look at meals or newspaper articles or school lessons, "little and often" has replaced the solid fare, physical or mental, of our ancestors. Something analogous is necessary in the arrangements of worship.

* See Mr. Browne-Wilkinson's pamphlet for the psychological aspect of this.

IV

Children's Services are not our subject, but a little may be said about an afternoon Evensong. Suppose a working-class parish in which a fair number of children come to an unsatisfactory Children's Service. Evensong at 6.30 is attended by a handful, and the Vicar feels that something along the lines of a mission service would suit his people better at night. Could any better plan be adopted than a carefully rendered Evensong at 3 p.m., with a Catechizing as ordered by the Prayer Book after the Second Lesson? A special children's choir could be formed, boys and girls in equal numbers, with a weekly practice. They would occupy the front seats of the church. The elder children of the Sunday School would be brought to church and have their attendances marked. The simple instruction of the Catechizing would be suitable for adults as well as for children. The fact of having the regular Prayer Book Service and not a Children's Service would make it easier to retain the older children. It would probably be found that the break after the Second Lesson made the service psychologically more effective for children than when the address comes at the close. The parson would have the satisfaction of complete obedience to the Prayer Book.

Such a service would be still more applicable to a village church served by a priest from a neighbouring parish, who cannot do more than give a celebration once a month and an afternoon service each Sunday. If the church is used again in the evening the lay-reader could conduct a non-liturgical service; the people will appreciate it if the Prayer Book Services are confined to ordained ministers. In both cases there is the great advantage that the children are being trained to worship in the Prayer Book manner. If later they should ask, in the town parish, for the full Prayer Book Evensong at night in place of experimental mission services, nothing better could be desired.*

V

We now come to the Evening Service. It should be carefully noted that the present method, harmless though the illegality be, is not countenanced by the Prayer Book, which recognizes only two forms of address, the Sermon at the Eucharist, and the Catechizing at Evensong. The 1928 Book, which in many other respects legalizes existing deviations from the norm of 1661, does not sanction the adding of an additional service, consisting of at least Sermon, Hymn and Blessing, to

* For such an afternoon Children's Evensong *The Church and School Hymnal* would be very suitable.

Evensong. (The hymn before the Sermon is sanctioned by the new rubric, the third of the "General Rubrics," permitting a hymn to be sung at the end of Evensong.) Existing practice, however, recognizes the appending of an *after-service* to the Prayer Book Office. Our suggestion is that such after-services should be carefully planned to afford the greatest possible interest and variety.

Our evening problem is one of making the service attractive. We rightly shun such an aim in connection with the Eucharist. If our Lord in His Sacrament is not attractive to instructed Churchpeople, our resources are at an end. But what is the purpose of the Evening Service? It is twofold: (1) We want to see a substantial number of our morning worshippers there, that they may receive the instruction they have largely failed to receive from the unduly shortened morning sermon; their duty of Sunday worship has been already fulfilled. (2) We want to provide something of a missionary character for those who do not come in the morning. Neither object can be attained without taking far more trouble than we generally take *and without exalting the Sermon*. The following plan is put forward for consideration.

Begin Evensong at 6.30 and finish punctually at 7. Then let the choir go home, on most Sundays, or sit in the body of the church to lead the hymn-singing. Evensong over, the after-service begins. This should be most carefully planned in accordance with a programme settled three months ahead and known to the parish. The essence of it will be variety, which may take the following forms:

1. Sometimes at least the arrangement should remain as at present. Thus at the great festivals the after-service, including the procession, will be as long as Evensong itself.

2. Frequently the Sermon will be the chief thing, lasting 25 to 30 minutes, often forming part of a course, the subject always being announced beforehand; the help of visiting clergy will be freely enlisted. It is impossible to treat certain subjects adequately in less time. The benefit of this separation of Sermon and Evensong is obvious. At present, if the priest wishes to preach a course of sermons on, let us say, "The Bible and Modern Criticism," he is faced with a dilemma. For want of such sermons, thoughtful modern-minded people stay away from church; but if he introduces them casually he "upsets" some of his most devout people and the odds are that few, if any, of those he is trying to help are in church. By the plan suggested, his teaching has a chance of hitting the mark. After the Sermon prayers lasting ten minutes or so will be said. With hymns the after-service will last nearly an hour. While people will be

encouraged to stop from 6.30 to 7.50 or 8, the 7 o'clock Service will be announced separately and a minute or two will be given for those who arrive at 7 to find their places.

The message of the Church proclaimed during the Liturgy will always be given by a priest, but there is no reason why a layman should not speak after Evensong. Probably many a layman could preach one sermon on his own subject with great profit to the hearers; a panel of Diocesan lay-speakers, delivering their message at different centres, is needed rather than lay-readers ministering permanently at one place. Such long sermons, whether delivered by priests or laymen, will be primarily intellectual and instructional in character. Granted that the gifts of the laity may be used in this way, is there any valid reason for excluding women from giving an address at a non-liturgical service in the nave? At least it would be far less startling to Catholic-minded people than certain things that took place in the naves of our churches in the Middle Ages would be if revived today.

3. On some occasions the address will be devotional, not exceeding 15 to 20 minutes. It will then be followed by a kind of prayer meeting, the "expression work" of the address. Needless to say, such experiments will be facilitated if the choir boys have gone home.

4. Devotions in a modified form, or Services of Thanksgiving for Holy Communion, might be used as an occasional after-service in churches where the small number of weekly communicants would make them unreal as a regular practice. Preparation services are now scantily attended and Communicants' Guilds languish. Thanksgiving may in itself form a preparation, sorely needed, for the next Communion.

5. At last we reach the choir. Once a month in some churches, less frequently in others, a special musical service might be held after Evensong, with solos, anthems, organ-pieces, etc. The programme would be printed and placed in the seats. For such a service, which would be reported in the local press, the choir would practise assiduously. On this Sunday they would have the field to themselves, except for five minutes of prayers and perhaps an address of the same length.

6. At least sometimes during the year an effort should be made to have a choral celebration of Holy Baptism. Summer time means that for a large part of the year it is light at 7 p.m. Babies are usually asleep at this time and rarely disturb the service.

VI

If such a plan as outlined above seems revolutionary, it may be replied that, if all is going well and Evensong on present lines fulfils its purpose of instructing the devout and drawing the outsider, clearly no change is desirable. But if it languishes, then experiments are legitimate. Indeed they are already being made along lines which ignore the requirements of the Prayer Book, and without any thought-out plan behind them. The advantage of the method sketched above is that it concentrates on the Sunday evening service held at the traditional hour the energies now often dissipated on "special efforts" and poorly attended weeknight services. It may well draw people to church who normally are not attracted either by the Eucharist or by Choir Offices; at least it breaks the ice for them and shows them the way to the church door. It keeps Evensong for those who value it and is loyal to the Prayer Book. It is an orderly development in line with the traditions of Anglicanism, carrying further the possibilities of the existing after-service.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE PROVISION OF SERVICES FOR CHURCHPEOPLE OVERSEAS

SUPPOSE that I said that the main work of the clergy whom we send to itinerate those enormous areas which are called "parishes" overseas, is to hold services for the four, or five, or ten, or twelve, or more "churches" which are to be found in them; and suppose that I said that the common idea of the duty of the Church at home in relation to settlers overseas is that she ought to "provide services" for them; would anyone dispute the truth of those statements? Is it necessary for me to collect extracts from speeches and books in which this idea is either explicitly stated, or taken for granted, in order to prove that the idea is commonly held, and commonly found in practice overseas? I think that it is not necessary: I shall take it as accepted.

I wish then to examine this practice, and its effects, as I have myself seen it. I shall not mention names and places. I have visited Western Canada, Southern Rhodesia, South Africa, Assam, looking solely and entirely at the position of the Church and the meaning of these things, and I shall leave anyone who knows any of those countries to guess where exactly I learnt what I say. I suspect that anyone who knows any *one* of them will say

that he recognizes the case, for though a certain aspect came home to me with its full force in some places which I visited later, yet looking back I see that I might have observed it in places which I visited earlier in my journey, if my eyes had been open, and that I had seen it earlier without fully appreciating its meaning.

I went, then, at the invitation of a Bishop to hold a service at a certain place where no service had been held for many months. I was directed to take an evening service one day and to celebrate the next morning. I was, of course, most kindly and hospitably entertained by one of the people. I was told that the congregation at the evening service would be composed of a few Churchpeople, some Presbyterians, and some members of other Christian denominations. It was taken for granted that the congregation would not know its way about a Prayer Book, and a little service book was provided which contained a form of service, a shortened Evensong, with a psalm or two printed in the place where it should be said, or sung, to avoid the difficulty of turning to a Psalter to find a psalm. It was, in fact, a form of service so designed that any Christian of any denomination might find nothing in it to disturb him. It was a service which might have been taken by any Christian layman. I heard one of the clergy of the diocese tell the Bishop that he thought it would be a good thing to have directions—Stand up, Sit down, Kneel—printed in heavy type; because, simple as the book was, the congregations often hesitated, uncertain what to do next.

This, then, was the first thing which struck me. I was sent to conduct an undenominational service.

I asked one of the earnest good Churchpeople how it affected her. A priest appears on one of his rare visits: he holds a service attended by people who are not Churchpeople. Some of them drift in simply because it is something to do; some of them are people who have a sort of idea that it is a good thing to attend a religious service occasionally; and attendance salves their conscience and helps them to think that they are "all right." It is not a Church service for members of a Church who know what they are, and meet for their own proper service because they are Churchpeople; it is not a mission service held by a body of Churchpeople who open their doors for a public meeting in order to put before their neighbours the truths by which they live and by which they would have others live. It is a service for Churchpeople constructed to satisfy people who are not Churchpeople. I asked her: "Does it not strike you as unreal? Do you not feel, when you attend such a service and look at the congregation, that there is something hollow about it?" And

do not the people attend, and then go their ways, and do you not all feel that there is no real *Church* in this at all?" The answer that I received was more expressive in its tone than in its actual wording. "Yes—or Certainly—that is exactly what I feel," does not give the force of the answer. I learnt that a Church service is the service of a "Church," of a real living society of men and women who meet as a society, as a family, for common prayer and praise and instruction, not merely a service conducted by a Church minister. When Churchpeople are provided with that sort of service, when that sort of service is provided for them by the highest authority in the Church, it is not surprising that many of them can see little difference between attending a service taken by a minister of the Church and a service taken by a minister of any denomination. They learn to think it is enough if some Christian service is held and they attend it.

But I was sent not only to take that evening service, I was sent also to celebrate the Holy Communion, and that certainly is a service for Churchpeople. I have not forgotten that, and I will discuss it in a moment, but before I leave the evening service I want to make two further notes: one on the apparent ignorance of the services in the Prayer Book, and the rules of behaviour, and the other on the apparent indifference and apathy of English Churchpeople overseas.

I mentioned that the congregations are *expected* to behave as if they were unfamiliar with the Prayer Book, and therefore a book is provided which takes this for granted. The apparent ignorance is noticeable not only on the part of people who are not Churchpeople, and therefore might be expected to be unfamiliar with the book, but also on the part of Churchpeople who ought to be familiar with it. I have heard clerics adduce this apparent ignorance as a proof of the real ignorance of the Churchpeople with whom they have to do. That is by no means necessarily the case. I remember once standing as godfather to an infant. I had baptized many children; I was thoroughly familiar with the service; I knew it by heart; but I had never before been in the position of godfather. I did not open the Prayer Book, taking it for granted that I could not forget the words. To my amazement I behaved as if I had never read the Baptismal Office in my life: in the middle of the service I was hunting for the words. Remembering that experience once when I walked home with some Churchpeople in a far country who had apparently lost their way in the service, I remarked how curious it was that people who have been quite at home in an English church, when they find themselves one of a few suddenly confronted with the fact that the responses depend upon them,

are confused and speechless. And I said: "I have heard a cleric say that you need, Stand up, and Kneel down, printed in thick type to guide you. I suppose, as a matter of fact, you know the responses by heart, and the order of the service perfectly." The answer given me was: "Well, I never had any difficulty at home." And I said to myself: "We too often treat Churchpeople overseas as ignorant babies when they are not." If these people were expected to bring their own Prayer Books and use them, and the service was used frequently by them, they would very soon get over that hesitation; and members of other denominations who are really ignorant of the Prayer Book would either get them and learn to use them, or would realize that they were attending a Church service which Churchpeople understood. This little book provided for them does not help them; no leaded type would help them; it only helps them to forget the use of their Prayer Books, and breaks an important link with their past. If Churchpeople overseas were expected to have Prayer Books and to know how to use them, they would soon learn to do what was expected of them. We ask nothing, and so get nothing; or we ask, and do not receive, because we do not ask in faith. And the service is held so infrequently that people who really do know, and hesitate only because they are suddenly faced with an unfamiliar demand upon them, never get over that hesitation, and never cease to be afraid of their own voices. Then the impression is produced and the fable repeated that they are lamentably ignorant, whilst all the time they are really being taught to forget what they once knew well. I have seen regular communicants, at a private celebration in a room in their own house, stand up when I stood up at the beginning of the Communion Office to say the Lord's Prayer, and look miserably uncomfortable, and hesitate whether they ought to stand up at the reading of the Gospel. That was not ignorance, but the influence of unfamiliar conditions, and the cure for it is not exhortation or verbal directions, but repetition under the same conditions: very soon they are at home.

A similar misunderstanding lies at the root of the common complaint of the clergy that Churchpeople overseas are religiously apathetic or indifferent. There is much indifference and apathy overseas, as there is at home; but, to hear some clergy talk, you would think that it was almost universal. What I have observed is that failure to attend services held at rare intervals is no proof of apathy, though it may be the road to it. When men have no service for three Sundays out of four or for twelve out of thirteen, they easily make engagements which preclude their attendance at the service held on the fourth or the thirteenth, and then they learn to live without any

services at all. They do appear indifferent. Even so, there are generally a few who overcome even those obstacles, and never even appear indifferent or apathetic: and of those who appear indifferent not so many are really indifferent as appears on the surface. Many whom we are apt to call indifferent are really in vigorous opposition the moment that they meet any living religious movement, and many at once shake off their apparent apathy the moment that a serious call to action is made upon them. Opposition is not indifference, and an indifference which disappears the moment a real call for action is recognized is not very deep. But services held by an itinerant cleric once a month or once a quarter naturally bring the appearance of indifference into the foreground. The holding of a service is accepted as part of a civilized life; men can attend or not as they like; it is infrequent; only a few zealous souls make a point of attending it; there is little to call out either strong support or strong opposition. Many will subscribe money to keep it going who do not care much about it, and will call it the padre's business. All this tends to produce an appearance of apathy and indifference. What has surprised me in my visits overseas has been, not the indifference, but the latent zeal, the readiness to recognize that it is not good enough. Occasional services held *for* people are the causes rather than the revealers of indifference. To say that men are indifferent because they do not come regularly to services so held for them is as near to the truth, and as far from it, as to say that men are ignorant of the Prayer Book services because they hesitate and "lose their places" at the service.

Now let us turn to the celebration of the Holy Communion. I have heard a Bishop say that men object to a celebration at three o'clock in the afternoon, but that the objection is absurd; because if a man has to hold services at three different places every Sunday for a month, if the celebration was not held at 3 p.m. at one of them, the people there would never get any opportunity of receiving the Holy Communion. I have never myself been asked to do that. I have been asked, as I said, to take an evening service, and then a celebration the next morning, either at the same place or at some place not very far distant. The congregation was generally small and consisted of the Churchpeople in the neighbourhood who were really earnest Churchpeople, with the exception of one or two who were kept away by urgent business, or occasionally by some failure in the arrangements for letting them know that a celebration would take place on that day. People so kept away might have no opportunity of attending for a long time. The service was a service held for them, not their service. It was held then,

because the priest could come then, not because it was a day when they could come.

I went to one place which the Bishop had himself visited on the previous Sunday, and I met a man who began to explain the reasons for his absence from the celebration held by the Bishop; and I celebrated for him and one or two of his neighbours the next morning in his own house. After the service I told them that it seemed to me absurd that Churchpeople should be in such a position, that business or sickness on one day should rob them of the Holy Communion for months; and that in a little group like that they ought to have one or two men ordained so that they might be able to make their own arrangements, and have the grace of Christ's Sacraments always at hand. The suggestion did not perturb them, though it surprised them. They said: "Of course we could do that; and then if we could not meet on Sunday we could meet on Monday, or one other day in the week." A woman said: "If we could do that, we could draw the young men who come out to join us. They always turn to us when they first arrive, because they have left their mothers and sisters and sweethearts at home. And we could have a little service in the evening in our own houses, and they would join us perhaps first in that. There is a young man coming out here next month: we could draw him in."

I perceived that the Holy Communion is not simply a service which is held by a visiting cleric for a few zealous Churchpeople occasionally; but the service of a society, a fellowship, a group of Christian people who meet to observe the Lord's commands and to seek His Grace, as He taught them to do. That society, that fellowship, seeing that it is the Church, meets as a Church to observe its own proper rites, uniting its members in communion with one another in Christ. And I perceived that that is what is needed by scattered groups of Churchpeople overseas. They need the Church as a properly constituted fellowship, or society, in which they live bound by their common participation in the Sacraments to a godly and a Christian life.

That is why something is lost when men go away to some distant place to "make their communion"; that is why bishops who say that men can "get their communion," if only they will take the trouble to travel ten or twenty miles, make a mistake. This conception of "making a communion" is too individual: the mutual support of the group of communicants is lost, the fellowship is broken, the power of the Church in the group is weakened. When the Churchpeople in a group know that they are the Church in that place, and are organized as the Church, and meet to celebrate the Holy Communion as their own proper rite, then the fellowship of the Church is realized; but when in-

dividuals go away to some other place to make their communion, or when the Holy Communion is celebrated only when a visitor can come, and each individual attends, or fails to attend, simply as an individual, then the Church in the place has little reality, and the sense of mutual responsibility and of fellowship is lost.

I have met young men overseas just out from England who have come to a celebration, and I have asked them what they did in England. One such told me, "I always went to church every Sunday with my father, and regularly once a month to the Holy Communion." I asked whether he missed that, and he said that he did. I wondered how long he would continue to miss it. Two things had gone out of his religious life, the regularity represented by "every Sunday and once a month regularly," and the fellowship represented by "with my father." The churchgoing "every Sunday" was changed for at least three Sundays out of four when there was no service to attend, and the "once a month" was changed for an occasional celebration, if he happened to be able to attend on the day when the priest came. And for the fellowship of the father's company there was nothing. There was no local church composed of the communicants there arranging services at times when all could attend; there was not that fellowship of one human soul expecting the other, because they had agreed to meet. It may be said that the padre will miss him; but we must remember that the padre is only a visitor and will be gone in a moment, probably before he has seen him. That is not the same thing.

Men overseas need the fellowship of the Church; they need to feel themselves members of a society which is real and present and active; a society in which they have a definite place from which they will be missed; a society which will feel bitterly any lapse on their part. Many a young man would have been saved from moral lapses if he had been a member of a real church in the district where he lived, bound by his communion with that body and conscious that all the members would feel bitterly any lapse on his part, and this strength of fellowship is not less when the group is small. But if that society is the Church, then the Church must be able to arrange its own services and conduct its own proper rites. A society which cannot do that is not a society, and a Church which cannot do that is not a Church.

There is only one way that I have ever heard in which Church-people overseas can so be organized as the Church in all the little scattered groups all over the world, and that is by ordaining for them proper ministers who can lead them, and whose authority to lead is unquestionable. We must begin with the few, and let them be established, that they may draw into their society men who will never shake off their apparent indifference by attending

services held for them. Until we do that itinerant priests may travel night and day and offer services to the people, but there will not be that fellowship in the Church which today is lacking. Men need that fellowship, and to that fellowship, when they see it, they will be attracted.

ROLAND ALLEN.

TWO FUNCTIONS OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

DURING the course of that deservedly famous analysis of religion with which von Hügel begins his *Mystical Element of Religion*, he says, "I believe because I am told, because it is true, because it answers to my deepest interior experiences and needs."* Probably no better summary of the factors which go to make a mature religion could be found. Wherever religious conviction is solidly and firmly grounded, it is both psychologically true and rationally desirable that authority, reason, and experience should meet in a complex unity. Each factor supports and corrects the others, and a religion which markedly lacks one of these elements is proportionately weak or eccentric.

Authority—which covers the two ideas of Revelation and Tradition—supplies a body of dogmatic truth which is the fruit of the experience and thought of many generations of saints, theologians, and ordinary people. To ignore it or flout it is shallow and silly. Reason unceasingly checks and amplifies the legacy of the past by aligning it with new knowledge, and especially by making adjustments between the religious and the non-religious interpretations of life and the world. A religion which ignores this antiseptic activity of reason becomes morbid or fantastic.

When we come to consider the contribution of religious experience, "my deepest interior experiences and needs," we find ourselves in more difficult waters. The content of the idea "religious experience" is so great that generalization about it is highly precarious. Moreover, we are brought to those philosophical presuppositions of theology on which doctors have always disagreed; for religious experience is a department of experience as a whole, and the lists are at once set for the old battle between rationalist and empiricist. There are obvious difficulties both in defining religious experience and in correlating its claims with those of reason. Yet both tasks have a new urgency

* *Op. cit.*, p. 54 (2nd edit., 1923).

today, because religious experience looms very large in all modern discussion of religious matters. No phrase is more familiar to the educated religious public. Not only the plain man, who has always believed that the heart has its reasons, but the philosopher and the scientist are paying attention to the claims of religious experience. Indeed, philosophers refer to it with a respect which the older rationalism would have frowned upon as a compromise with superstition. Where, until quite recently, people would have spoken of the grace of God or Divine Immanence in the language of dogmatic theology, they now talk of religious experience in the language of psychology.

The reasons for the change are not far to seek, and I need not do more than make a brief reference to them. Ever since the seventeenth century, "the century of genius," set modern experimental science going, the stress on experience has been inevitable, because the conception of knowledge as the resolute use of pure reason has faded away. This disappearance of confidence in pure reason is the chief difference between the mediæval and the modern mind. Physical science has achieved its triumphs by making reason follow in the wake of experiment. Later, the psychologists have drawn attention to the processes of experience, and in particular to the non-rational factors in experience, including cognitive experience, so carrying on from a different angle the work of Kant, William James, and Bergson in revealing the part played by the apprehending mind in all cognitive processes. There has been a reaction against "subjectivism" in modern philosophy, and realism is the fashionable school. But it is interesting to observe that the reaction against "idealism" has not had the effect of bringing the philosophically-minded scientist back to any naïve conception of scientific knowing as the merely passive contact of mind with objects. On the contrary, such writers as Whitehead, Hobson, and Eddington are foremost in asserting the strictly symbolic and artificial character of the scientific account of reality, and its dependence on the constructional activity of the mind. Thus there comes from various movements of thought a deepening assurance that the apprehension of reality demands more than the bare rigour of accurate logic; and in particular it is widely believed that the intuitions of the poets and the religious experiences of mankind are vehicles of truth.

We may assume, I think, without argument that religious experience has certainly a part to play in determining the nature of religious conviction and practice. But what is that part to be?

We can probably agree that a primary function of experience is to give to the individual believer a deeper assurance. It is

his personal exploration of the religious field, and his discovery of the religious objects and his intercourse with them. It vitalizes the dry bones of dogma and reason; it clothes them with the living body of religion. In this function experience is secondary to authority and reason. I learn that God is my Father from some organ of authority: I accept that dogma as rationally sound on general philosophical grounds. Then my experience of life and devotion supervenes to strengthen conviction, because I find my wants supplied, my sins forgiven, my life cleansed and enriched in thought, imagination, and action, my soul moved to penitence, adoration, and thanksgiving. These religious experiences come in to reinforce what may have been no more than a provisional and tentative acceptance of a belief: and though the act of faith never loses its faith-quality, the element of risk is progressively eliminated as experience increasingly verifies the initial hypothesis. It is not to be supposed that this analysis of a living process into three stages is anything more than a *post-mortem*. In actual life we do not first learn, then reason, then experience, in a formal sequence: except in early childhood all three processes go on more or less concurrently, first one, then another factor attaining prominence, but all contributing some share to the whole. For the whole adaptation which began with the first acceptance of what I was told about God is a reaction of a living person, functioning with all sides of its nature.

A further point emerges from this function of religious experience as supporting an already formed belief. It deserves to be remembered that religious experience is not found in a pure state, uncontaminated by reason and authority. The distinction between these three is a distinction in thought, not in fact. Indeed we may, if we like, point out that reasoning and obedience to authority are both modes of experience, and that when they operate in the religious sphere they are modes of religious experience. But if we distinguish, as we do here and as we may properly do for purposes of analysis, between reason, authority, and those varied experiences of satisfaction, forgiveness, enrichment, penitence, worship, etc., which we spoke of above as "religious experiences," then it still remains true that the distinction is not to be pressed too far, though now for a different reason. An experience is only religious in virtue of an interpretation which we give to it as a result of some kind of inferential process: and that interpretation is usually suggested from without by a source which inspires respect. To put it shortly, religion always implies a theology, and does not exist without it. The reasoning may be bad; the theology may be worthless. But if we are to have anything that can be called

a *religious* experience, there must be with it some inference of supernatural presence or causation, conceived of as directly responsible for the experience. Merely to feel awe in the presence of the unknown, the sublime, or the terrible is not to have a religious experience; unless indeed we are to call "religious" every reaction to a rough sea, a railway accident, or even a big bang.

Is this function of religious experience as subordinate to authority and reason its only legitimate function? Are we, for instance, to say with Dr. Matthews,* "It is surely a complete misreading of the order of events to suppose that experience comes first and afterwards gives rise to belief about God and the world. On the contrary, ideas of God and of His relation with the soul, of redemption and the aim of life, are accepted from the social environment and on authority. Experience grows around them"? With great respect to a philosophical theologian of Dr. Matthews' eminence, I venture to suggest that this is to over-simplify the issue, and that religious experience has a second function whereby, within certain limits, it does "come first."

1. In the first place, we may develop a suggestion made by Mr. Will Spens in a paper contributed to *THEOLOGY*, January, 1925, on "Theology and Religious Experience." Mr. Spens draws attention to an intermediate link, which he calls a "mental attitude," interposed between a particular belief and the resultant religious experience. The experience, for example, of strength and peace derived from belief in God is mediated, according to this view, by a mental attitude of worship, love, penitence, and the like: the mental attitude is the direct result of the belief, and the experience the indirect or remote result of the belief, but the direct result of the mental attitude. It follows, therefore, that if mental attitudes in different persons approximate, their religious experiences will be much the same, but their beliefs may be even widely different. Anyone who has known devout Unitarians will appreciate the value of this distinction: for we often find in them an attitude to Jesus Christ and a religious experience closely allied to those of orthodox Christians, despite the variation in beliefs.

From the standpoint of orthodoxy it is clear that here we have a case in which religious experience has emerged before the appearance of the beliefs which rationalize it. Brought within the atmosphere of Jesus Christ, such persons are led by their loving admiration of Him to form a mental attitude which, though not the same, is very like the mental attitude of orthodox believers. Yet, for reasons which we need not consider here,

* *Studies in Christian Philosophy*, p. 8 (2nd edit., 1928).

their belief remains definitely Unitarian, and might be expected to bar the way to such an experience.

Again, an agnostic may form a mental attitude, with its corresponding experience, which, though in his case it is only potentially religious, becomes actually religious when he takes the step of acknowledging the logical implications of his attitude. There are many young men and women in this condition, held back from the Faith by various intellectual difficulties, yet kept on the fringe of the Church and attending its worship because experience has preceded explicit belief. I should be surprised if the travelling secretaries of the Student Christian Movement were not constantly in touch with such people.

2. Again, *once we have religious beliefs*, we may have a religious experience which leads, not to the alteration of our existing beliefs, but to the addition of further congruous beliefs. In other words, religious experience is a potent factor in what, since Newman, we have come to call development. It is obvious that the explicit beliefs of the primitive Church were not in all points the same as those of Catholic Christians today. What has brought about the change from an undeveloped to a developed Catholicism? In part it was forced upon the Church by the need to combat heresy, and was the safeguarding of the essentials of the apostolic faith by the defining of what was and what was not compatible with that faith. But it was the religious experience of the Catholic Church which enabled it to detect the poisons of Arianism and Monophysitism and to prefer the wholesome food of orthodoxy. In virtue of the religious experience of the Church, it was possible to hold fast both the divinity and the humanity of our Lord, despite the plausible hypotheses of heretic intellectuals, to maintain the *hypostasis* of the Holy Ghost, and to make explicit the full doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Something of the same kind has happened with the doctrine of the Atonement. It is the stubborn persistence of an undeniable, complex religious experience which makes the Church, though she has never defined any theory of the Atonement, refuse to commit herself to any once-born, Abelardian reduction of that doctrine, or, on the other hand, to any purely substitutionary hypothesis. At the present time Eucharistic doctrine is the scene of a like struggle between a rather hide-bound intellectualism and the inconvenient intuitions of religious experience. The scientific rigorism of Dr. Barnes will not allow the possibility of evidence that cannot be compressed into the narrow mould of his cast-iron theology. But if reasonable and enlightened people go on finding our Lord sacramentally present outside the action of the Eucharist, if, in von Hügel's phrase, saints have been made by devotion to our Lord in the Reserved Sacrament,

we shall not show our enlightenment by turning a blind eye to these facts of religious experience, and, in the supposed interests of Protestant truth, denying the very forces which make for religious and theological progress.

I conclude, therefore, that religious experience has more than the one function of bringing personal assurance of what is already accepted from authority and reason. Where you have a widespread and persistent religious experience, newly emerging from a religious system of doctrine and practice already established and firmly grounded, that experience does point to a need for some expansion or evolution of belief. Scientific experimentalism has its analogue in religion. Reason must, of course, exercise her function of freely and fully criticizing any such expansion, and she may find good ground for rejecting much that at first sight seems the appropriate doctrinal sequel of the experience. But, within the limits that we have emphasized, it will not be her function to deny the experience any right to exist or to pretend that the possibilities of Christian thought and devotion were exhausted in the first or even (shall we say ?) in the sixteenth century of our era.

HENRY BALMFORTH.

THE INCARNATION

[*Note.*—The following paper was written for the Southampton Society for the Study of Religion, and is printed substantially in the form in which it was read. A brief introduction of a somewhat personal kind is omitted; and a section will be added at the end of the paper dealing with some of the issues that were raised in the discussion.—E. G. S.]

I

I WILL venture to begin this paper with a brief survey of the principal moments as they seem to me in the history of thought upon the Incarnation in the last forty years. Thirty-eight years would perhaps be more accurate, as it was in 1891 that Dr. Gore's Bampton Lectures were delivered; and they shall be our starting-point. The choice may be deemed arbitrary: not a generation earlier Liddon's Bampton Lectures on "The Divinity of our Lord" had handled the same theme with all the richness and power which the greatest preacher of his day commanded. And throughout the intervening generation the Incarnation had provided the dominating *motif* of the biblical scholarship and philosophical theology of Bishop Westcott. But Gore's Bampton provide us with a good

starting-point none the less. They were an exact and formal study in Dogmatics, such as neither Liddon nor Westcott had provided; they came from the pen of one who had already, in *Lux Mundi*, given a decisive term to Anglican and Anglo-Catholic theology; and, moreover, from the position adopted in those lectures the author, still the most commanding figure in English divinity, has never deviated by a hair's breadth.

The great appeal of Gore's Bampton's lay in their clear statement and exposition of orthodox Catholic dogma. They brought precision and clarity into a region where such qualities had been thought somewhat out of place; and they showed that the patristic formularies were not only logically coherent, but also alive and glowing with religious reality and fire. People felt that the Christian Faith might be losing some of its ancient hold; but at least it would not go by default through ignorance of what it was. Everyone should now know to what the Church was committed by its creeds. Here was a defence, not only against unbelief without, but against vagueness and sentimentality within. It is not surprising that these Bampton's quickly became a standard work of dogmatic theology on the Incarnation—a position they have held ever since.

There was, however, a difficulty, a loose end; and it was implicit in the treatment of the problem. Orthodox Christology hinged upon the assertion of Two Natures—the divine and the human—in the One Christ. The question naturally arises, as it arose in antiquity, as to how we may conceive these Two Natures to be joined in One Person. The Bampton Lecturer might have been inclined to dismiss such a question as over-speculative and to insist that on this, as on many other matters, we must be content to be agnostic. But Charles Gore was precluded from this by the historical honesty which compelled him to face the problem of our Lord's inerrancy recently raised by the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament. One may doubt whether the historical accuracy of the first chapter of Jonah or the Davidic authorship of the 110th Psalm does, of necessity, raise that problem; but it was certainly felt to raise it thirty years ago. And, to meet it, Dr. Gore fell back upon the old Alexandrian doctrine of the *kenosis*: the Son, that is to say, emptied Himself of His divine attributes, such as omniscience, when He became Incarnate. The idea could claim considerable authority; but it was not felt to be satisfactory, either exegetically or doctrinally. Succeeding divines have been unable, moreover, to rest in it. On the one hand, Dr. Mackintosh reacted altogether against the doctrine of the Two Natures as involving an impossible dualism in our Lord's single Personality. On the other, Bishop Weston devoted himself, in *The One Christ*, to showing

that the Chalcedonian definition involved no such dilemma: he conceived of the Eternal Son as imposing upon Himself such a "law of self-restraint" that "He has, as Incarnate, no existence and no activity outside the conditions that manhood imposes upon Him." More recently Dr. Temple has countered the kenotic theory with another: what the Son did in becoming Incarnate was not to divest Himself of divine attributes—otherwise the world would have ceased to exist—but to add to those which He already possessed others proper to man.

A solution of the problem of the Two Natures along somewhat original lines was put forward by Dr. Sanday, but with indifferent success. His *Christologies Ancient and Modern* appeared in 1910, when the then novel idea of the sub-conscious had been popularized by William James and others. Sanday suggested that this new psychology might be harnessed to the Christological problem, and that we might conceive of our Lord's divine nature as dwelling in His sub-conscious personality, while the conscious element was the sphere of His Humanity. Great difficulties were felt on every side in this solution; and now that the sub-conscious has made way for the unconscious in a still more up-to-date psychology, these difficulties would, I think, be felt even more acutely.

Concurrently with this movement of dogmatic theology in England, there was taking place in Germany a study of our Lord's Person from a very different angle. The names of Harnack, Jülicher, Pfleiderer, Wendt—to mention only a few—stand for as concentrated a criticism of the New Testament as has ever been undertaken in the history of Christian theology. Synoptic criticism had given scholars a new method of research into the Gospels; and it was confidently believed that it must yield great results for Christology. The concept of development was also borrowed from science and brought to bear upon the problem; and its solution was held to depend upon tracing out the development of our Lord's filial and Messianic Self-Consciousness in the Synoptic story. The result was the Jesus of Liberal Protestantism.

I need not describe that figure; its lineaments are too well-known. Nor is it strictly relevant to this paper; for on that theory it would be a misnomer to speak of an Incarnation. But this line of study had an important by-product in Ritschlianism. Ritschl was unwilling to part company entirely with orthodox Christology; and he endeavoured to save what could be saved by saying that, though Jesus was not God, He had the value of God for us; and on this principle of value-judgment he claimed to reconstruct the whole of Christian doctrine in a form acceptable to the modern mind and consistent with the supposed

results of criticism. The attempt, however, failed even in Germany. On the one hand, the mind of man in its religious quest insists on passing beyond value-judgments to existential judgments. It must say "God is" before it says that "He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." On the other, the historical foundation, which was really the *raison d'être* of the whole structure, collapsed. Johannes Weiss and Schweitzer showed that the supposed development of our Lord's Self-Consciousness was a figment; the real development in the Gospel story was a development of events against the background of the impending End of the Age; the central figure of the Gospels Himself defied analysis, and must remain "a stranger and an enigma" to our Western world.

Dogmatic theology, psychology, history—all three were drawn upon in the twenty-five years following Dr. Gore's Bampton; and none seemed to offer a solution of the problem set by the orthodox dogma of the Two Natures. I shall come shortly to consider some reasons for this; but, first, mention should be made of a much more radical movement which appeared to render all these discussions irrelevant. This movement found, moreover, in Mr. R. J. Campbell, then at the height of his fame as the pastor of the City Temple, a popular exponent of rare magnetism and force. The "New Theology," as it was called, was no doubt no more new than many other things which claim the name; Ralph Waldo Trine was already in the field with it across the Atlantic, and Emerson—for those who understood him—had been the prophet of a similar doctrine. But the "New Theology" was new at the time to most Englishmen, and its appeal was wide. The problem of the Two Natures, it said, was not confined to the case of our Lord. "Christ is divine," the legend ran, "and so are we." All men have two natures, a divine and a human, the divine indwelling the human in every man, though more manifestly in some than in others. The Incarnation was not something *sui generis*, but rather the supreme example of the universal law of divine Immanence: the difference between Christ and ourselves was one of degree and not of kind.

The Immanentism of the "New Theology" found an echo in many quarters. From the City Temple the contagion passed to the stage; and Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson stirred large audiences to tears with *The Passing of the Third Floor Back*. Even the Roman Catholic Church—on the Continent if not in England—showed symptoms of having caught the infection. I remember paying a brief visit in 1906 to one of the leaders of Italian Modernism, Signor Alfieri, then at Milan. It was the time of Blondel and Le Roy in Paris; of Fogazzaro's *Il Santo*,

which was in every cultured drawing-room in Europe; of *Il Programma dei Modernisti*—everywhere conferences, documents, emissaries passing this way and that, secret conclaves, heart-breaking betrayals, strange alliances of young theologians with young apostles of social reform. Yes, the Pope was right, when eventually he spoke: Immanentism lay at the root of the new movement, the mother of its heresies, the source of its inspiration and its peril.

The Pope condemned it; but it was not the Pope's condemnation that destroyed it. Tyrrell was excommunicated, and Loisy had withdrawn into Positivism; but much of the movement was beyond reach of any Papal bull, and would only succumb to blows of a more palpable kind. What shattered the popular Immanentism was the war. In face of that, you could not say that man was divine. Heroic, yes; capable of splendid sacrifice, yes; touched by the supernatural, yes; but not divine. Those fearful passions then released had been there, in man's heart, all the time. The God he cried for was not within, but above. Considering men, at least, might fairly say that Immanentism was the one and only doctrine by which you could make God responsible for the war. The Christology of the Creeds might not be easy to understand; but at least the Christ of the crucifixes in France spoke home to every heart, not simply because He suffered and died—that was after all our lot and our fault—but because He, being God, being without sin, being unlike us suffered and died as Man for men.

II

The task of assessing the influence upon English and European theology of the experiences of the war is one which still awaits the pen of the historian and divine; and it would take me aside from the purpose of this paper if I were to dwell upon it here. But three results may, I think, be noted which are both germane to our subject and not likely to be disputed. First, the war kindled a new demand for supernatural religion, and a fresh recognition of its presence in Christianity. In England the Lambeth Appeal of 1920, and not less the ringing accents of the First Anglo-Catholic Congress, were felt to be a real recapturing of "the first fine careless rapture" of the Gospel. In the philosophy of religion Baron von Hügel, whose works had been hitherto the property of the few, became the teacher and guide of a multitude. In Germany Rudolf Otto's *Das Heilige*, which passed through ten editions in the five years following its publication in 1917, and since its translation in 1923 has had a similar vogue in this country, introduced a new category, that

of the Numinous, into religious thought, which was at once recognized as of revolutionary significance. Secondly, this reaction to the Supernatural, which showed itself ecclesiastically and devotionally as a Catholic revival, was accompanied by the abandonment of many false trails. Dr. Inge, in his *Romanes Lecture*, pronounced a funeral oration over the doctrine of Progress, which had been first cousin to the popular pre-war Immanentism. In Germany New Testament criticism was felt to have run into a blind alley, and there was a widespread return among theologians to that positive and doctrinal divinity which was native to the Lutheran tradition. Thirdly, there came to the fore a new apologetic, of which the key-note was religious experience. Springing originally from the work of William James, it had been broadened and developed by Tyrrell and the Modernists, and given systematic expression by the present Master of Corpus in his *Belief and Practice* (1913); but it was not until the war was over that it was seen to portend a widespread re-analysis and underpinning of theology upon an empirical basis. The result has been to provide a new setting for religious life and thought, and its expression in doctrine.

The principles of this new outlook may be enumerated as follows:

1. The term "religious experience" is not intended to denote religious emotions and thrills, but rather the totality of the believing man's experience of life—his sense of duty and vocation, his consciousness of sin and pardon, his capacity for worship—so far as these are referred to a divine Object of belief.

2. Religious experience has the same claim as any other form of experience to be considered an experience of reality. The element of subjectivism in it may be larger than is the case with sensible experience, though indeed Professor Eddington and the New Physics seem to have somewhat turned the tables on the claim of sensible experience to be free from subjectivism. But at any rate the difference between the two types of experience, so far as their validity is concerned, is only one of degree.

3. Dogma is primarily prophetic in character, and represents vivid intuitions, which synthesize experience and are felt to be authoritative revelations. When this experience includes historical experience, the dogma which synthesizes it includes an historical element, though its symbolic element still remains. Further, in the measure in which it is sought to express a body of experience in the categories of current thought, dogma will contain a metaphysical element. Yet again, dogma possesses a technical *differentia*: it denotes not all religious doctrine which has the character above described, but only such doctrine as

has been defined by the mind of the Church as part of the Church's Faith, because universally verified and verifiable in its experience.

4. Revelation and Dogma are, therefore, like the religious experience which they embody, the *data* of theology: as Father Tyrrell said, they "do not control theology as statement controls statement, they control it as a science is controlled by its subject-matter." The task of theology is to "conserve and account for the value of dogmas as a guide to religious experience,"* and to demonstrate the rational coherence of religious beliefs both with one another and with the rest of human knowledge.

I have laid down these propositions in somewhat arbitrary form, because I want to give some idea of what one may call the grammar of this empirical theology. Many prior questions are left unanswered, many points unexplained; but it was necessary to say so much as an introduction to a further consideration of Christology.

Let us consider first the fact which all Christology is an attempt to account for. That fact is a complex religious experience which, from whatever angle you look at it, is centred in Christ. I call it complex, because it includes "moments" so various as the experiences of pardon and reconciliation with God, of the indwelling power of the Spirit, of missionary vocation, of duties towards our neighbours, of an attitude of worship: but to all these, in their Christian form, in one way or another, Christ is central. The fact stands out most clearly in the New Testament, which gives normative expression to the complex of Christian experience; and within the New Testament St. Paul's phrase "in Christ" covers all, or nearly all, its manifestations. Nearly half a century has passed since Lightfoot pointed out that that phrase was the most characteristic in the whole of the Apostle's vocabulary and represented the heart of his teaching; and in recent years New Testament scholarship—witness, for example, the work of Deismann or Heiler—has endorsed Lightfoot's dictum. The primary fact which Christology has to account for is this Christo-centric experience, which has persisted in Christian faith, worship, and life from St. Paul's day to our own. But someone may say: "That is true, if you consider Christian experience from St. Paul's day to our own. But it leaves aside the question whether St. Paul was not responsible for a rapid, and disastrous, development of the original experience. For the historical Jesus was not, and did not desire to be, the centre of a religious experience, but to direct the faith and interest of His disciples towards the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man." Into the merits of this issue as a matter

* The Master of Corpus in *Expository Times*, March, 1929, p. 265a.

of history I will not now stop to enquire: I will only say that no answer has yet been forthcoming to such criticism of Liberal Protestantism as is represented by Sir Edwyn Hoskyn's contribution to *Essays Catholic and Critical*. At the same time our imaginary objector raises a point of real interest and importance. He is wrong—so I should submit—on his main contention that our Lord is not central—and central by His own choice and teaching—to the religious experience portrayed in the Synoptic story. The proportion of each Gospel given to the last week of our Lord's ministry and to His death and resurrection; the way in which the ideas of the Kingdom and of the Son of Man are more and more interfused, as the story proceeds; and the fact that the training of the Twelve occupies so great a part of our Lord's time—these are facts of the Synoptic presentation which are decisive for its meaning. "And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus went before them and they were amazed; and as they followed, they were afraid" (Mark x. 32). For the Evangelist who wrote that, Christ was the central fact of experience.

At the same time there is unquestionably development, both of experience and of the doctrine which accounts for it, in the pages of the New Testament. The call of the Apostles on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, when at the mere word of Jesus the fishermen left their work and their homes to follow Him without delay, represents a decisive moment in the story; and the impression made afterwards by His teaching is vividly expressed in St. Peter's words recorded in the Fourth Gospel: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." These experiences, together with the mighty works of Jesus, were what prepared the way for the flash of illumination which drew from St. Peter at Cæsarea Philippi the confession, "Thou art the Christ." Those words have been rightly regarded as the beginnings of Christological dogma. The beginnings only, however: we are still far short of faith in the Incarnation. Nor is our Lord's teaching from this time onwards concerned so much with leading the disciples on to that faith as with deepening the half-faith they already possessed by connecting it with the conception of the Suffering Servant in Isaiah. He was Messiah, but such a Messiah as must suffer, die, and rise again. The truth was that the disciples could not pass on to the fuller faith until after our Lord had risen and ascended, and the Holy Spirit had been given.

St. John's words "the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified" are words that have a far wider application than the particular occasion to which the Evangelist refers them. The decisive moment in the whole

development of Christian experience was, in fact, our Lord's glorification. Before that took place, the Christian experience existed only in germ—a glimmer of faith and hope, moving almost wholly within the limits of Jewish Messianism. But after the resurrection all was changed. St. Thomas's words, "My Lord and my God," which go so far beyond the Petrine confession, may be regarded by some as historically dubious: but the utterance expresses at least the difference which the resurrection made to the disciples' faith, and reflects faithfully the extraordinary enrichment of monotheism which took place in the Apostolic Church. Later dogmas of the Incarnation are no more than an attempt to expound and interpret that original prophetic utterance of the once doubting disciple.

The development of Christology in St. Paul illustrates the stages through which the early Church passed on its way to the mature faith of the Incarnation.* We see him struggling at first with thought-forms which are obviously not adequate for their content, such, for example, as the conception of the "second man" who is "the Lord from heaven." A similar conception seems to underlie the great Christological passage in Philippians ii., though here an historical element is added. Gradually, however, we find the Apostle breaking out of these purely Judaic categories into others of wider sweep: Christ is the first-born of all creation, the image of the invisible God, the centre of coherence to the whole of Reality. No great development is involved between this mature Paulinism and the doctrine of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel; and the fusion of the spiritual and the historical in the normative experience of the Church of the New Testament is perfectly represented in the great Johannine text: "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth."

E. G. SELWYN.

* The development may be studied to most advantage in Dr. Rawlinson's Bampton Lectures, entitled "The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ."

(To be concluded.)

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE *Truro Diocesan Gazette* is always interesting—not least last month when its “Notes and Comments” were devoted to a consideration of the “partisan policy” noticeable in recent Crown appointments in the Church. On one matter, however, we are puzzled by the *Gazette*, which speaks of our remarks on constitutional episcopacy (May, p. 241) as “perplexing.” We think that the meaning of the phrase is really simple enough. It means an episcopacy which functions according to its proper constitution—i.e., in obedience to the rules of the Church and through consultation with the clergy in synod, rather than as the instrument of a supposed national religion acting by prelatial decree. The episcopacy we mean is well exemplified at Truro.

We have received the first six numbers of *Little Papers on the Monastic Life* (2d. each), to be had of the Society for Promoting Retreats, Eccleston Square, S.W. They contain clear and simple teaching on the Religious Life, and will be a valuable addition to any literature stall in a church. The papers before us deal mainly with the monastic vocation for men, and we hope that the opportunities it offers to women will also be considered.

Among the Manuals of the Inner Life published by S.P.C.K., *A Book of Prayers for Everyman* is one that should not be missed. It contains in forty pages much that can be used in church as well as in private devotion. The section entitled “Worship and Adoration” strikes us as particularly valuable. There are several blank pages at the end for each to fill in for himself, so that the book may become a real *Vade Mecum*.

NOTES

(a) THE LITURGY OF 1928

IN October, 1927, when there seemed every probability that the Revised Prayer Book would receive the authorization of both Church and State, a few priests met at my house for a week's conference. Our object was to examine the book and see how the best interests of the Church could be served through its copious alternatives within a strict observance of the rubrics. The conference, though small (several important members were prevented at the last moment from attending), was representative of widely different opinion amongst the Catholic clergy. We gave special and close attention to the new Communion office, and the conference ended by its celebration with deacon and subdeacon in my private chapel. The occasional offices were left over for a future session which, owing to the

rejection of the Book by Parliament, and lack of Synodical sanction, never took place.

The present liturgical position of the Church is chaotic. (I may observe, in passing, that if only the Catholic clergy, eschewing mere individual and congregational considerations, would unite in advocating *any* course—e.g., the "Green Book," 1549 or 1928, with or without modifications—for the purpose of winning for the Mass its proper place throughout the Church of England, their position at this juncture would be immensely strong and they would do a service to the Church at large by promoting some kind of uniformity and order; we lack both statesmanship and discipline.) From all I can discover there is no sign yet of a strong movement in any part of the Church of England to adopt the 1928 liturgy, but as the revised Prayer Book is now printed, published, and commended by some Bishops, it is possible that in certain quarters it may come into practical use. In this case, the following memoranda, to which our conference agreed after very careful consideration, may serve as a commentary and a ceremonial guide to the 1928 Canon on two important points; if that Canon is used, it had better be used intelligently.

THE CONSECRATION

The New Consecration Prayer contains:

1. The Narration, or Words of Institution;
2. The Anamnesis;
3. The Epiclesis.

At which point are the Bread and Wine consecrated, for it is at this moment that the accustomed ceremonial of worship should take place? These three contents are found in both Western and Eastern Consecration rites and with, I think, one trifling exception in this order (not transposed as in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.), for it seems difficult to resist the conclusion that the *Supplices te rogamus* is the Epiclesis of the Roman Liturgy.* The importance attached to the Words of Institution and the Epiclesis by the Western and Eastern Churches respectively is well known. The first question which arises is: Have the compilers of the New Consecration Prayer altered the balance from West to East? The answer seems to be in the negative. In the first place the intention of the English Bishops has been asserted emphatically—i.e., to make no change in doctrine. Thus, if the New Consecration Prayer altered the doctrine it was by inadvertence. But it is clear that they have not turned the Western form of Consecration into an Eastern one, as the following opinion from one of the foremost theologians of the Greek Church shows. He gives his reasons thus: "That this (the Consecration of the Elements by

* The arguments are set out at length in the great work *Mysterium Fidei*, by Maurice de la Taille, S.J. (Paris, 1924, pp. 273-283), where it is maintained that the "jube hæc perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum" has precisely the same consecratory sense as the Eastern, Gallican and Mozarabic prayer for the hallowing by the Holy Spirit. In the one the Gifts are sought to be hallowed by being taken up, in the other by grace being poured on them from above. And in the Holy Mysteries Christ is the Consecrator, Christ is the Victim, Christ is the Altar on high of which the earthly altar is the image, and Christ is the Holy Angel of the Covenant. De la Taille further shows why the Epiclesis coming after the change of the bread and wine by the words of our Lord is neither repugnant nor unnecessary, but congruous (pp. 438-453).

the Commemoration of the Words of Institution) continues to be the view of the compilers of the New Prayer Book is apparent from the 'laying the hand on the Elements' not at the Epiclesis, as we do, but during the Words of Institution. Furthermore, the phrasing of the Epiclesis does not fully correspond to that of the Orthodox Church, since in the Epiclesis of the Orthodox Church the change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ is sought objectively, without giving any suggestion of subjectivity, which subjectivity is not excluded by the words of the Epiclesis of the New Prayer Book." We may here profitably consider the authorized doctrine of the Uniate Greeks—i.e., of the Greek Churches in Union with Rome. Whilst like the Westerns they teach that the Words of Institution are "ad sacramentum conficiendum," they say "dici potest Institutionem et Epiclesim sese vicissim complere ad integrandum sacrificium."* Following this their ceremonial is to make an act of adoration after "This is my Body," etc., and "This is my Blood," etc., and again after, or rather during, the Epiclesis in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom.

It seems, therefore, that the accustomed practice of acts of adoration after the Words of Institution should be maintained: another is advised after the new Epiclesis, although it is not so definite as the purely Eastern Epiclesis of the Uniates, and in that respect bears more resemblance to the "jube hæc perferri."

THE MIMETIC ACTS

These, which in the Prayer Book of 1662 are associated closely with the Communion of the people, are separated from it by a considerable interval. This is not of importance as they were never intended to be practical but purely mimetic, or symbolic.

It might be urged that, as in an earlier rubric a distinction is made between *bread* and *wafer*, when wafers are used—and they are now explicitly recognized—the breaking is not necessary. But let us take the view that every attempt should be made to carry out the rubrics of the new book even when they present difficulties. It is obvious that one wafer should be selected for the mimetic action: which should it be? Not the Host,† for two reasons. First, this is no longer the ceremonial fraction, for that is now in its right place as in all the ancient liturgies, Eastern and Western, except the Abyssinian Jacobite. It has always been argued that when words carrying a ceremonial action have been taken away, the ceremony has been removed also. By a parity of reasoning, when the words are restored the ceremony must be restored—in this case the Fraction at the Pax. Secondly, the object of the mimetic action is to symbolize the distribution to the people. But the priest's wafer is consumed by himself: it is not distributed. The conclusion seems to be that the priest should select one of the people's wafers for the "Breaking of the Bread." At our Lord's Words of Institution, the point at which the Prayer Book orders the bread to be broken, the Sarum Manual advises touching the Host, but not breaking it. This is also a Scriptural practice. But premising that no rubric should be disobeyed without grave reason—the attitude, it is to be assumed, of any priests using the 1928 liturgy—the suggestion as above is made.

* The distinguished Eastern theologian quoted above would accept this second sentence as Orthodox.

† I.e., the priest's wafer, or obley, as distinct from the people's wafers.

A few words in conclusion. The question of the Reservation rubrics has been hopelessly confused by the introduction of doctrinal controversy. I think the Modernist tendencies throughout the book, especially its treatment of Holy Scripture, are far graver than generally recognized; these prevented me from voting for it at any stage in the Church Assembly. The present danger to the Catholic party is not the opposition of an effete Protestantism but its disintegration and its gradual alienation from the historic Churches of Christendom who will stand firm on Scripture and Tradition. The Mass, on the other hand, is a distinct improvement on that of 1662. Two alterations, one on the face of it trivial, the other really necessary, both liturgically and practically, seem called for: (1) The alternative of the *Kyrie eleisons* to that of the Ten Commandments, or, what is worse, the "Summary," to be extended to Sundays. (2) The disentanglement of the communicants' preparation, its replacement immediately before their communion, and its omission when it is known that no communicants will present themselves. The present use at, let us say, a late High Mass, is very unseemly and, indeed, irreverent. If the Bishops are really anxious to promote the use of the 1928 liturgy they would be wise to allow, at any rate tacitly, these alterations in a book which confessedly is now only put forth as a guide to departures from 1662. No doubt many priests would ask in addition for the alteration of the place of the Epiclesis, following 1549 and the Green Book. I do not share the dislike to the sequence, though I should prefer a version of the *Supplices te rogamus* instead of the present weak and quasi-Eastern form.

ATHELSTAN RILEY.

(b) ADULT RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Editor has been good enough to ask for some account of a conference held at High Leigh from May 28 to 30, under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Middleton, dealing with this subject, and convened by an unofficial body known as the "Teaching Church" Group. For the benefit of those to whom this title is unfamiliar, it may be explained that the T.C.G. had its origin in a body of people, experienced in the work of adult religious education, nominated by the Bishop of Manchester in 1925 as the result of a meeting of educationists held at King's College, London. The Group was known as The Bishop of Manchester's Group until Dr. Temple's translation to York, and the new title was designed to connect the whole work of the Group with a volume which it produced in the spring of last year—*The Teaching Church: A Handbook of Religious Education*, by the Bishop of Manchester and others (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d.).*

The objectives of the T.C.G., to which all its activities have been related, may be briefly stated. They are: to help to create and to mould public opinion in the Church as to the immense importance of adult religious education in the widest sense; to put enquirers into touch with the various organizations concerned with particular aspects or methods or subjects

* Other publications of the Group are: *Materials for the Study of Adult Religious Education* (S.P.C.K., 2d.)—this contains a good deal of information as to the provision that exists for adult religious education; and *The "Teaching Church" Papers*, a series of fifteen pamphlets, costing a few pence each (S.P.C.K.), dealing with various aspects of the whole subject: eight of the fifteen have already appeared.

of adult religious education ; and, in whatever ways may present themselves, to stimulate diocesan and parochial enterprise in the matter.

The conference at High Leigh was attended by about a hundred people (clerical and lay, men and women) from more than thirty dioceses. Many more had booked places, but an event of some importance to the political life of the nation on May 30 prevented many people at the last moment from coming at all, and took away others, whose polling booths were in distant parts of the country, before the concluding session. That the Conference was abundantly worth holding, however, in spite of these difficulties, nobody who was present had any doubt. It was immediately preceded, for members of the Group itself, by a short "Retreat," at which the addresses were given by Miss Evelyn Underhill.

The programme of the Conference was undoubtedly overloaded. The Content, the Principles and Methods, and the Organization (in diocese, town and village) of Adult Religious Education—to say nothing of two stiff introductory papers, a devotional address at Compline each evening, and two longish periods of Group discussion!—was rather too large a dose, in so short a time, for a group of people consisting, not only of those actually engaged in A.R.E. of one kind or another, but of others who, while alive to its importance in the life of the Church today, were present as enquirers rather than as experts. The papers read were as follows: A Mind for the Kingdom (Canon B. K. Cunningham); The Mind and the Heart (Rev. L. Dewar); The Content of A.R.E. (Bishop of St. Albans); The Relation of the Work of the B.B.C. to that of such bodies as the T.C.G. (Mr. Siepmann, of the B.B.C.); The Initiation and Organization of A.R.E. (i.) In the Diocese (Rev. H. Hurst), (ii.) In a Town Parish (Bishop of Peterborough), (iii.) In a Country Parish (Canon A. L. Woodard).

The Group discussions on the first day were on such questions as the place and purpose of Old Testament study; possible methods of approach to the problem presented by the apparently widespread indifference to religion; the merits and demerits of the Church Catechism as a framework of A.R.E., and of the pulpit as an instrument of education; the place of theology in A.R.E. On the second day, the groups were asked to consider more obviously "practical" problems, suggested by the questions: The development of A.R.E. in your diocese? Possible assistance from T.C.G. in this development? The practical difficulties of giving A.R.E. its rightful place in the activities of a town (or of a country) parish? and the means of overcoming them? The "findings" of the groups in answer to these questions were of extraordinary interest: they have not yet been formally considered by the T.C.G. Committee, but it is safe to say that they will have a great influence on the work of the Group.

It may be added that the Chairman of the T.C.G. is the Archbishop of York; the Convener (and Chairman of the Executive), the Rev. Canon A. L. Woodard, Sutton Vicarage, Ely, Cambs; and the Hon. Secretary, the Rev. Cyril E. Hudson, Hillingdon, St. Albans (to whom enquiries and correspondence may be addressed).

C. E. H.

REVIEW

FRENCH CHURCH ARCHITECTURE. By E. Tyrrell Green. Sheldon Press. 10s. 6d.

As a general manual of French ecclesiology, this book has conspicuous merits. Apart from works of a technical kind and handbooks, by no means of equal excellence, to individual churches, there is no English book which deals with the subject in any more serious spirit than that of the casual traveller, open to picturesque impressions. Mr. Tyrrell Green's book thus meets a real need. His knowledge of French churches is remarkably wide and thorough, and with a keen appreciation of beauties of design and detail he combines a gift for classifying the leading features of buildings and tracing their mutual relations. His neat and delicate drawings have not that inspiration with which, in the early days of the Gothic revival, J. L. Petit's forcible sketches illustrated the beauties of foreign churches and brought out their structural character with peculiar vividness of touch; but their accuracy and sense of proportion leave little to be desired. It is noticeable that these drawings are, with few exceptions, confined to towers and spires: the interiors of churches and the exteriors of such great buildings as the cathedrals of Chartres, Bourges, and Albi are left to the photographer.

Of the three traditional essentials of architecture, *dispositio*, *constructio*, and *venustas*, it is the last which appeals most strongly to Mr. Green. In this respect, his work is in striking contrast to the severely practical and unemotional treatises of French archæologists, who leave the glory and gloom of their churches to speak for themselves, and concentrate their attention upon scientific analysis of plan and construction. Not the least remarkable quality of French churches is the endless skill with which builders introduced variations into one common form of plan, and, though this is not overlooked by Mr. Green, he is more ready to praise the finished effect than to examine the source of its perfection. The absence of a series of ground-plans from the volume is a noticeable defect. Again, to most modern writers on architecture, the development of vaulting construction is the key to the history of mediæval art. Mr. Green is quick to notice points of difference between those local varieties of Romanesque which show so many types of experiment in this

direction, and mentions such exceptional instances as the cupola vaulting of Le Puy, the spired vaults of Loches, and the barrel vaults at right angles to the longer axis of the nave at Tournus. Naturally, he recognizes the domed vault as the leading motive of the so-called school of Périgord, to which the late Eugène Lefèvre-Pontalis, in one of his last publications, denied a claim to consideration as a purely local type. On the other hand, the vaults of Poitou are treated as mere incidents in churches remarkable for the richness of their surface decoration; and, in an otherwise excellent description of the striking churches of Auvergne, the system of vaulting and abutment which is responsible for their idiosyncrasies is hardly noticed.

Thus, while the book cannot fail to quicken the interest of the intelligent reader in an architecture which was the highest achievement of the Middle Ages, he will learn more from it of the outward attraction of such works of art than of the fundamental causes which made them what they are. At the same time, the book fulfils its purpose as a general conspectus of the beauties of French churches, which does not stop short at the Middle Ages, but includes Renaissance architecture in its survey. Of the author's personal knowledge of the numerous buildings to which he refers there are abundant indications: it is difficult to find a church of real importance omitted from his lists, though some of the eastern departments of France, especially in the Burgundian province, might have furnished him with more examples. His catalogues of illustrations are occasionally rather heterogeneous: a list of noteworthy Romanesque *chevets* (pp. 27, 28) includes the early Gothic apse of Vézelay, and we should have cited Nôtre-Dame de la Coûtüre at Le Mans in preference to Nôtre-Dame du Pré. The great two-storeyed narthex at Tournus (p. 49) deserves further comment than it receives: here and in other places, the original relation of the narthex to the church behind it involves problems which cannot be referred to the influence of the narthex at Cluny. A footnote on the same page connects the double transept of some English cathedrals with Cluny through St. Hugh of Lincoln; but St. Hugh came from the diocese of Grenoble, his training was not Cluniac but Carthusian, and the double transept had appeared at Canterbury before it was seen at Lincoln. It is always dangerous to trace the personal influence of prelates in the plan and structure of buildings which they encouraged, and this imaginative pastime has been carried to some excess in England. There was no doubt "an interchange of master-minds" between England and Normandy in the eleventh century (p. 112), with regard to architecture as to other things; but the master-minds were in this case those of professional

artists rather than those of statesmen and theologians such as Lanfranc.

The general accuracy shown in the forms of names is a welcome contrast to the negligence with which English writers courteously respond to the struggles of Frenchmen with our spelling. The favourite pitfall which English, and even French authors seldom wholly escape, the distinction between Châlons-sur-Marne and Chalon-sur-Saône, is here avoided by the absence of any reference to the second of these places. There are a few mistakes—*e.g.*, Ygrandes for Ygrande, Mohun-sur-Yèvre for Méhun-sur-Yèvre, Villeneuve-le-Gayard for Villeneuve-la-Guyard. Valréas, mentioned as in the department of Vaucluse, is in that of Drôme. Mr. Green's use of the forms Civrav, Clamecy, Orçival is wrong; but one of these misplaced cedillas might be transferred to Ferrière-l'Arcon, now usually spelt Ferrière-Larçon.

A. HAMILTON THOMPSON.

NOTICES

PRIMITIVE BELIEFS IN THE NORTH-EAST OF SCOTLAND. By J. M. McPherson, B.D. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

In contrast to the currents of modern thought amidst which the Church has to steer a straight course today, there are numerous backwaters where the tide of human progress has been arrested for centuries, so that large groups of people are now only just emerging from a primitive state of culture. These are to be found not only in the Balkans and the Iberian Peninsula, but within the limits of our own island. Thus, as the volume before us reveals, the rural and maritime parts of the North-East of Scotland are a veritable mine of primitive belief and practice from which Mr. McPherson has drawn invaluable material for the purposes of the anthropologist and the folklorist, while the theologian will also discover things of importance for his work from this source.

The first part of the volume gives a detailed account of the worship of nature which finds expression in such rites as those associated with fire, water, wells, trees, stones, caves, the spirit of the corn and the "earth spirits" tenanted the little green knolls and invisible to mortal eye except when they made themselves known in human form. These are the "fairies," or "fair folk," in contradistinction to the witches whose malevolent works are described in the second section of the book. Witchcraft, it is true, was not always malignant, and the author refers to the theriomorphic proclivities of those witches who assumed the form of hares, dogs, ravens, bees, and magpies, but normally they practised the Black Art, and therefore their activities were anti-social and illicit. The Grand Master of their ritual organization was the Devil, and it was into his service that these workers of evil magic were initiated and dedicated themselves by Satanic rites.

There is reason to think that witchcraft was a definitely constituted cult at one time, organized in opposition to the Church, which probably partly accounts for the drastic action of the ecclesiastical measures drawn up against its diabolical rival. It was also a profession, and its exponents had to work at it continually to gain a livelihood. In later times its rewards were meagre, but in its more palmy days the witch fared sumptuously. Payments were usually in kind, but even without any service rendered, the witch imposed a levy upon the community. It is therefore hardly surprising that she was unpopular, being at once a menace and a drag upon society.

The witch cult and nature worship doubtless had much in common in their original developments, but in their organized expressions they adopted different paths. The witches were a priesthood with magical rites, whereas the nature votaries made their individual approach to the supernatural without the intervention of any intermediary. "It was a simple faith transmitted from generation to generation, not of any organized caste, but from father to son and from mother to daughter." In North-East Scotland, where the fairies and witches had mingled by the sixteenth century, nature worship was generally beneficent in its effects despite the fact that fairies had become part of Satan's kingdom. The witch cult, while it did bring with it some knowledge of the healing art, was vitiated by the frequency with which that knowledge was turned to evil purpose. Therefore, both before and after the Reformation, the Church and Presbyterianism regarded it as a sacred duty to stamp out the evil, and at the same time to wean the faithful from their pagan shrines. With what success they pursued this course the reader will discover from the pages of this illuminating volume.

E. O. JAMES.

A HEROINE OF THE NORTH: MEMOIRS OF CHARLOTTE SELINA BOMPAS, WIFE OF THE FIRST BISHOP OF SELKIRK (YUKON). Compiled by S. A. Archer. S.P.C.K. 5s.

"Heroine" is no term of hyperbole for this little-known woman—a helpmeet for "An Apostle of the North." The present Bishop of Yukon complains of being known as the one Bishop who has actually eaten his boots. The repetition of such an anecdote must be tiresome, but it cannot be as tiresome as the actual experience of being driven to eat one's boots. And this is in the direct line of descent from experiences which were commonplaces of daily existence to Mrs. Bompas, at least for periods, sometimes as long as eight consecutive years, during thirty years of the most arduous life.

The memoirs consist chiefly of the letters and journals written by Mrs. Bompas between the years of 1874 and 1906, and the Victorian repose and smoothness of style make it necessary to keep reminding oneself of the salient points of the story, or the marvel and miracle of such heroism flow over the mind making no impression.

Mrs. Bompas was forty-four years of age when she married her cousin and went out with him to his pioneer diocese in North-West Canada. Her upbringing from early childhood in Italy, with her gifts of personal and intellectual beauty, her talents for music and poetry, together with her frailty of body, might seem to have pointed her to a life of cultured ease. Indeed, as the matter-of-fact records of starvation, privations,

extremes of heat and cold, lack of the barest necessities for light and cleanliness, unfold themselves year after year, it requires an effort fully to realize what it must have meant to a delicate lady of culture, who up to middle life had never had to be troubled by the mere framework of existence. Any reader whose own intellectual life is jarred by the intrusion of intractable, mundane, material matters, even in the comparative opulence of England, will write Mrs. Bompas down as saint and heroine more on account of this voluntary abnegation, and her adherence to it for over thirty years, than for any other reason.

And the heart and explanation of the wonder of it is found in her own words telling of the details of her daily life to her much-loved sister at home. "I rise soon after six o'clock. Jacob lights my stove in the adjoining room a little before, so the room is tolerably warm by the time I go into it. Then I have a quiet time of one hour or more, and then grope my way back into my bedroom, where there is not one spark of light to help me dress." Again, later: "Feast of the Purification, 1875. . . . I arose at six o'clock and had my sweet quiet time by firelight."

Only so was it possible to face the day with its full complement of difficulties as to ways and means, dealing with primitive and often degraded Indians, and long-drawn-out anxieties over her husband's safety during his long absences from her.

One who visited them in 1903 writes of "two septuagenarians of grace and broad culture . . . who have deliberately chosen an austere type of service, not for austerity's sake, but for Christ's sake, under circumstances that the average citizen would feel to be past endurance."

Here is a story great enough for the most hungry-souled adolescent, if "unpacked" and presented with the emphasis not found in the understatement of Mrs. Bompas' simple writing.

M. BROWNE-WILKINSON.

ENGLISH ECCLESIASTICAL STUDIES. By Rose Graham. S.P.C.K. 15s.

This volume consists of a collection of Miss Graham's delightful and learned studies of mediæval history. As the result of much persevering research among original authorities they are highly welcome, for the more we know, from first-hand sources, of the actual state of life in the Middle Ages the better. Too long has the thinking of many otherwise sagacious people been led astray by what Dr. Hamilton Thompson has called "a romantic and sentimental conception of the Middle Ages which is at variance with fact."

The subject of a number of the Essays is Cluny and the English houses dependent upon it. An interesting account is given of the rise of the Cluniac movement and of its relation to other attempts at reviving and developing the Benedictine ideal. Miss Graham lays great emphasis upon the influence of the Customs of the monk Bernard in spreading Cluniac ideals: even Lanfranc's Constitutions of Canterbury, which are usually supposed to have been founded on those of Bec, are traced back to it. From the same Customs she gives us a description, full of enlightening details, of the kind of life which was lived in a monastery in the latter part of the eleventh century.

Miss Graham has devoted a good deal of study to the financial affairs of the monastery, an exceedingly important aspect since so much of the

energy of the monks was normally taken up in administration. In the middle years of the thirteenth century, to which special attention is devoted, many of the monasteries had embarked upon the most lavish building schemes, and in order to carry them out they involved themselves very deeply in debt. To raise money all kinds of devices were adopted to tempt pilgrims and their money. The doubtful methods of the monks, in which forged documents not seldom played a part, as well as the greed of laymen, brought about many lawsuits, and so the property was further wasted. The monastic houses had also to bear their share of taxation both national and papal. Hence there was a gradual decay, which the Black Death hastened only too speedily. In connection with the subject of clerical taxes, it may be well to mention that this volume contains a reprint of the article on "The Taxation of Pope Nicholas IV.," which attracted so much notice when it was first published in the *English Historical Review*.

Not the least interesting Essay in the collection is that on "The Intellectual Influence of English Monasticism between the Tenth and Twelfth Centuries." This is a very careful and even inspiring piece of work, especially in these days when the thoughts of many are turning once more to a revival of the ideal of combined study and devotion as a means of renewing the life of the clergy. To all such this whole volume should make a strong appeal.

L. ELLIOTT BINNS.

THE FAITH OF THE CHURCH: AN EXPLANATION OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY FOR ENGLISH CATHOLICS. By Kenneth D. Mackenzie. Mowbray. 5s.

This book, says the preface, "is meant for lay people of education but scant leisure." The author's standard of education is high: it includes Latin, a language not invariably known even to the clergy, and some philosophical training. It would have been better to use much simpler language: even the highly educated are often quite unfamiliar with the categories of theology. St. Augustine is called, without explanation, "the African doctor" (p. 192): many readers will conclude that he was a physician! With these limitations, the work is admirably done. From the doctrine of God we proceed to Revelation, Salvation, and the Holy Spirit: thence to the Church and Sacraments, among which is included an excellent short account of the history and nature of Penance, showing how the present practice originated in the monasteries of Ireland, and spread thence to the whole Church. Then follow chapters on Grace, the World to Come, and a final chapter on Prayer, treated devotionally. It is a pity the author did not deal with the subject of Miracles, but a small book cannot cover everything.

But it is impossible not to criticize expressions which might pass in a more popular book, but which are surprising here. On p. 100 we are told that canons passed by provincial synods "are authoritative, *unless of course they conflict either with ecumenical law or custom*, or with the divine law." The italicized words (italics the reviewer's) suggest a limitation incompatible with the Anglican position. For the Anglican churches explicitly claim the right to alter even ecumenical laws and customs (Article 34), "ordained only by man's authority" (cf. also Articles 21, 32).

The most obvious case is clerical marriage. If anything is of ecumenical law and custom, it is the prohibition of marriage after ordination: which the Anglican provincial synods have reversed on the express ground that this prohibition is not required by the law of God. What, indeed, is "ecumenical law" for us? Rome regards the canons of Trent as ecumenical, Constantinople those of the Quinisext Council: we recognize neither.

Again, on p. 155, we find the phrase "the rest of the Western Church." Properly speaking, there is no such thing as "the Western Church"; but if we must use the phrase, it can only mean, "that part of the Church which adhered to Rome in her quarrel with Constantinople, and has since become centralized under the Pope." But of this organization the Anglican Churches are no longer part. Consequently the "precepts of the Western Church" (p. 188) are no more binding on us than those of the Quinisext Council. The Anglican Communion is now a third *οἰκουμένη* beside those of Rome and Constantinople. An analogous case is the Irish Free State, which is no longer part of the United Kingdom, though still part of the British Empire.

The author shows more charity than logic in trying to find some tolerable meaning in certain Roman dogmas. For as long as Rome maintains the oracular infallibility of Trent and the Vatican (rejected by the author, p. 95), reunion with her is out of the question. What, then, is the use of trying to explain away dogmas whose sole authority is that infallibility?

C. BEAUFORT MOSS.

THE POSTULATES OF THE MORAL LIFE. By J. Strain. Heffer. 7s. 6d.

This is a thoughtful and interesting book. It deserves and should gain attention. Mr. Strain's truth is "too sober to sparkle," but he writes in a style which makes it convincing and effective. Careful analysis of positions which would reduce the significance of moral conduct either as a social value or as an ingredient in knowledge paves the way for a justification of personal autonomy. Not the least valuable feature is his firm recognition of the clear outlines of the moral task, and of the limits to the domain in which self-determination must operate.

Though, objectively considered, man's resources are limited in all directions, yet is he "free born." So Mr. Strain leaves us with a metaphysical problem. On this note he closes, and he quotes Pascal:

"Toute notre dignité consiste donc en la pensée. C'est de là qu'il faut nous relever, et non de l'espace et de la durée que nous ne saurions remplir. Travaillons donc à bien penser: voilà le principe de la morale."

F. W. BUTLER.

THE CHURCH AND BODILY HEALING. By R. Ll. Langford James C. W. Daniell. 3s. 6d.

Dr. Langford James's book is an interesting study of the alliance between religion and science in the work of research for the conquest of disease. But it is an "unofficial" alliance, individual rather than corporate. The chapters on hospitals and on mediæval medicine are full of curious information, and there is a sympathetic description of the work at Lourdes. The extract from Cardinal Mercier's *Pastoral* (p. 50) is timely

and valuable as indicating a notable reaction from the Florentine decree and the accepted practice of Extreme Unction. But the author strongly dissents from the conclusions of Fr. Puller as set forth in his *Anointing of the Sick*.

Dr. James's views as to the actual healing ministry of the Church herself are of interest. He thinks the healing gift "may be a natural gift emerging through prayer and consecration to Christ as a supernatural gift" (p. 110). This seems a wide departure from the original commission to the Twelve and to the Seventy, where the gift is conferred on them as part of their equipment in preaching the Kingdom, with no reference to their personal preparation. In the same way his reference to the general sense of *δύναμις* as personal power (p. 56) does not cover the constant inference in the New Testament that if it is mediated through persons it is nevertheless of supernatural origin. Acts i. 8 is emphatic on this point.

And "a priest is endowed with an *office*, whereas the gift of healing is, we believe, a *personal* gift" (p. 108, italics in text)—comparable, as the author goes on to say, to the gift of preaching, or of spiritual direction, or even of musical ability. None of these things, however, find place as essentials in the act of ordination by which a priest is empowered for his ministry. A priest's administration of sacramental grace (and the author believes the grace of healing to be in some way sacramental) depends wholly upon his office as priest (Article XXVI.) and not upon his personal qualifications. But if the author's contention be right, then in some sacramental acts the priest depends on his commission; in others he depends on his personal gifts!

In this connection it is worth recalling that in the Canons of Hippolytus the prayer of consecration of a Bishop and of Ordination of a priest contains the petition that he may be a good healer—it applies in every case, as an intrinsic part of the ordination, and it is reflected in the commission to every Bishop consecrated by the English rite.

Dr. Langford James is mistaken in attributing to the present reviewer the opinion (which he does not hold) that the healing gifts are confined to the clergy. In support he quotes Chapter VIII. of *The Church's Ministry of Healing*—but that chapter is specifically a discussion of the relation of the clergy to this ministry. The charismatic gifts to the laity are discussed in Chapters IV. and VI. of that book. All the gifts are given to the whole Body in which priesthood and laity have each their sphere of ministration.

J. R. PRIDIE.

ISLAM IN SPAIN. By the Rev. Canon Sell. C.M.S., London. 3s.

This book is an extraordinarily cheap and readable account of Muslim rule in Spain. Forty years have passed since Lane Poole published *The Moors in Spain*, and since that date, save for the English translation of Dozy's work, little of importance has appeared in our language. Indeed it may be said that no English scholar has yet made himself a master of the literature of the great Muslim kingdom of the West. Readers of Rashdall's *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* will remember how tantalizingly inadequate his treatment of the Muslim Universities was. He used all the sources at his command, but, knowing no Arabic, he was unable to see the civilization as it was, and so could not communicate a true sense of its richness to his readers.

Canon Sell has applied himself to the task of setting forth the most important aspects of the rule of the Muslims in Spain and their final expulsion from the country. Thus he occupies himself principally with the political situation from reign to reign, sometimes turning aside to consider the sufferings of the Christian subjects of the Caliphs, and once or twice pausing to admire the zeal for learning which the Caliphs fostered.

To redress the balance somewhat the author adds a chapter on "Arabian Philosophy"; but most of this is occupied with a summary account of the means by which the Muslims attained a knowledge of Greek thought: less than a page is devoted to Ibn Hazm, one of the most prolific as also one of the most instructive writers of his time, and a little more to Averroes, who to the present day exercises no inconsiderable influence in the world of scholastic studies.

So far as it goes this book is to be warmly recommended, but we hope that a second edition will supply what it lacks, and that is an account of recent works on Spanish Islam which have come from the hand of Spanish scholars like Asin y Palacios, Ribera, and Palencia. The former's epoch-making work on the Hispano-Islamic origin of the principal ideas in the *Divina Commedia* was reviewed in these columns as long ago as 1921 and an English translation has since appeared. Again, the many studies of this fascinating writer on Ibn Hazm, the father of *Religionsgeschichte*, on Ibn-al-Arabi the mystic, on the Muslim precursors of St. Thomas Aquinas, to say nothing of the numerous works of Professor Asin's colleagues on the scientific discoveries of the Spanish Arabs, must not be ignored.

Among minor blemishes, due no doubt to the Madras printer, we note that many Arabic names are misspelt. It is a pity that "Caliph" should always be written "Khalifa": at any rate "Khalifate" must go. It is a barbarism. Also Dr. Sell must make up his mind as to whether he agrees (with the late Professor Browne) that the Muslims learned chiefly from the pagans of Harran (p. 145), or (with Mr. Bell) that the Christian Church was the testator (p. 170). The second quotation from Browne on p. 145 surely conveys the just view. We think, too, that the story of Roderick and Count Julian's daughter needs rewriting in the light of modern historical criticism.

If we have dwelt on the deficiencies rather than the many merits of this book it is not because the former predominate, but because we hope to see Canon Sell complete the important task which he has so well begun.

Since writing the above I have learned that Canon Sell has passed his eightieth year and has lost his sight. All that I have said should be read with those facts in mind. I congratulate the Church of England's senior Moslem missionary on this remarkable achievement.

ALFRED GUILLAUME.

THE LIFE OF RICHARD ROLLE. Together with an Edition of his English Lyrics (now for the first time published). By Frances M. M. Comper. J. M. Dent and Sons. 10s. 6d.

The appearance of two substantial and independent works upon the same subject in the same year is a coincidence which the student who is wise will hail with pleasure rather than regret, provided that he can manage to obtain access to both. Every student of Richard Rolle knows

that he cannot do without Miss Hope Emily Allen's *Writings of Richard Rolle* sold by the Oxford University Press for the Modern Language Association of America; and he (or she) will be sorely tempted to yield to the desire to possess Miss Comper's work as well. It will be not unwise to succumb, more especially since it contains materials hitherto unpublished. The reader will then be able to compare the descriptions of MSS. in the two books, to take note of a certain difference of standpoint and of treatment, to enjoy the pictures in Miss Comper's book, and to gain, perhaps, something more by way of help to a due appreciation of the famous fourteenth-century hermit. It is scarcely possible to deal with technical details in the necessarily restricted space of a short notice, but attention may be called to a point of some interest which has emerged in regard to the dating of the important Thornton MS. in Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library by comparison with the British Museum MS., Add. 31042. Miss Comper's sketch of Oxford in Rolle's time, of the influence of the Friars and especially of the Franciscans and of the studies there, covers somewhat familiar ground and invites comparison with the study which forms part of Dr. H. B. Workman's volumes on John Wyclif. It is in the next 160 pages, in which she is dealing with Richard Rolle's personal development in its mystical aspects, that she raises topics of special interest and, of course, lays her views open to discussion. Every student has to form some opinion as to the "calor," "canor," and "dulcor," and it may not always be easy. Miss Comper is certainly justified in saying, "Let us guard ourselves against thinking that any statement which Richard seems upon some sudden impulse to give is complete." But she is not altogether happy in adding: "We seize upon it with delight, as upon a plank in a morass, only to find our hopes shattered; for he has turned aside to another thought, or breaks out into some rhapsody of love." However, she adds his self-comparison to a nightingale, and we try to forget the morass until we come in a later chapter to a discussion, which can scarcely be called illuminating, of Richard Rolle and his friends on lines of treatment conventional to the present state of "psychology" when viewed from one particular angle. But these are minor criticisms of a book which is very pleasant reading and of which the second part, *The Lyrics*, charms not less because it is so largely Rolle himself with just the comments, explanations, and glossary that the ordinary reader will be likely to need.

BOOK NOTES

Self-Expression. By Father Vernon. Mowbray. 3s. Prayer is the highest form of self-expression, man's co-operation with the Supreme Life. Fr. Vernon shows its perfect example in Christ. The secret is to love actively as He loved. But "you cannot flirt with the world in the day and make love to God in the evening." Prayer is the necessary background of a life of co-operation. Some prayers and counsels are added.

The Idealism of Jesus: Studies in Practical Religion. By John E. McIntyre. Allenson. 6s. "The man who is of use in the world is the man who, instead of regarding truth as an enemy, welcomes it as a friend."

The world is moving with new thinkers and new forces. The author tries to do his part in bringing the Church into relation with the rising tide through his presentation of the many-sided character of Christ, the place of actual experience in religion, and the large method of God's working in the affairs of men.

How the Prayer Book came to Us. Gertrude Hollis. The Faith Press. 3s. Knowing Miss Hollis's experience as a writer, we feel that this book must have been written in a hurry, for it contains many inaccuracies, and such things as the origin of the Hours Services, and the use of Vestments look as if they had been brought in as an afterthought out of their right places. Such statements as that "Erasmus translated the New Testament into Greek so that scholars could compare it with the Latin Bible" must surely be slips of the pen. The book ends before Parliament's decision was known.

Christianity as Truth. Edward Grubb. The Swarthmore Press. 7s. 6d. In a former volume, *Christianity as Life*, the author said that Christianity involved a new outlook on the universe. This book is an attempt to show what that new outlook is. Does Christianity square with our new knowledge of biology, psychology, etc.? It deals with "an emergent order of relations which transcends the scope of biology." In this new order love is the redeeming and energizing power. The pain and evil of the world remain, but in Christ man's reaction to them is changed, "The watchword of the old order was self-preservation, that of the new, self-loss in love to God and man." "What Jesus proved is that the universe backs it."

M. D. R. W.

By Way of Illustration. By C. A. Ault. Mowbray. 3s. 6d. This admirable anthology of stories and illustrations ought to appeal to others besides the clergy for whose use it is intended. It would be a useful book to have lying about to pick up in odd moments when one would like to give a fresh turn to one's thoughts, and it might make a valued present to invalids who cannot read much at a time.

Gold, Frankincense and Myrrh. By Esmé Ratcliffe. Mowbray. 3s. 6d. This volume of original prayers is designed for those "who may be desiring to establish a true balance between the intelligence and the emotions." It would be more likely to fulfil the purpose if that balance were more noticeable in its pages. Its chief characteristic is a fervid elaboration of the obvious, tending to remind God of what He might possibly overlook. But there are probably some who find their devotional thinking is best stimulated in this way.

V. R.

The Varieties of Religious Experience. By William James. Longmans. 6s. This famous book, published in 1902, is reissued in a thirty-sixth impression, containing over 500 pages of good print. When all has been said in depreciation of its value—that abnormal experience is mainly described, that Protestant rather than Catholic experience is drawn upon, that the problem of the subconscious is differently viewed now—the book remains indispensable. Whatever else on the subject is read, this must not be neglected, and, in striking contrast to many recent books, it can be read with ease and pleasure from cover to cover.

The Office of the Ministry. By John Oman, D.D., S.C.M. 1s. These addresses given to Presbyterian ministers can be very definitely recommended to Anglican clergy. They are full of a *σεμνότης* that is most attractive. The difference of ministerial ideals in Scotland and England here revealed will give rise to profitable thought. The pamphlet ends with a beautiful story of how a batch of splendid recruits to the ministry came to Dr. Oman's college all at one time, from one parish, "when the minister was just setting his teeth and carrying on, dying on his feet of Bright's disease. It makes one wonder just what, in the sight of God, our best may really be."

The Wonderful Story. By G. R. Oakley. S.P.C.K. 5s. This is a life of our Lord for children of the Church, on conservative lines, written with consummate care and in a series of short chapters working in practically every passage of the Gospels and a great deal of illustrative information. It lacks the liveliness of modern religious books, and is indeed "heavy going" if read continuously. On the other hand, some readers find the conscientiously bright treatment of the immortal story so common today tedious, and will prefer the graver tone of this meritorious book.

The Philosophy of Plotinus. By W. R. Inge. Longmans. 2 vols. 21s. These Gifford lectures are among the glories of recent English scholarship. They have now reached a third edition, for which the author has re-read the *Enneads* and made many small corrections. He does not intend to alter the book again.

The Synoptic Problem and a New Solution. By R. H. Crompton. T. and T. Clark. 8s. This book could be safely passed over in silence, except for the chance of someone's buying it on the strength of the publisher's name. It is quite worthless. There is a fantastic theory that much of the Gospels was invented by the Alexandrian to rebuke the Palestinian Church. Apparently, nothing ever happened in history, all is idealism. "Christ had no objective and material personality. He is the Son of God."

The Ascent of the Mind to God. By Blessed Robert Bellarmine. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s. The great Bellarmine was a famous figure of the Counter-Reformation, at one time so famous in England that his "graybeard" features were moulded on beer jugs, in mockery. His life was very edifying. The present book shows the devotional side of a controversialist. The Ascent is "by a ladder of things created"; the writer uses the knowledge of his day, which has passed away, and though the book can be read with interest, few will be helped by it spiritually.

Francis James Chavasse. Blackwell. 6d. This beautiful little pamphlet contains appreciations of the saintly and beloved Bishop of Liverpool by five friends. A fuller notice must be postponed till the promised biography appears.

W. K. L. C.